461

Nov 1922

Gift of the Estate of Mrs. Frank Nov. 1940.

Sarge Bay.

THE KERR LECTURESHIP

THE "KERR LECTURESHIP" was founded by the TRUSTEES of the late Miss JOAN KERR, of Sanquhar, under her Deed of Settlement, and formally adopted by the United Presbyterian Synod in May 1886. In the following year, May 1887, provisions and conditions of the Lectureship, as finally adjusted, were adopted by the Synod, and embodied in a Memorandum, printed in the Appendix to the Synod Minutes, p. 489. From these the following excerpts are here given :—

II. The amount to be invested shall be £3000.

III. The object of the Lectureship is the promotion of the study of Scientific Theology in the United Presbyterian Church.

The Lectures shall be upon some such objects as the following, viz. :—

A. Historic Theology—

(1) Biblical Theology, (2) History of Doctrine, (3) Patristics, with special reference to the significance and authority of the first three centuries.

B. Systematic Theology—

(1) Christian Doctrine—(*a*) Philosophy of Religion, (*b*) Comparative Theology, (*c*) Anthropology, (*d*) Christology, (*e*) Soteriology, (*f*) Eschatology.

(2) Christian Ethics—(*a*) Doctrine of Sin, (*b*) Individual and Social Ethics, (*c*) The Sacraments, (*d*) The Place of Art in Religious Life and Worship.

Farther, the Committee of Selection shall from time to time, as they think fit, appoint as the subject of the Lectures any important Phases of Modern Religious Thought or Scientific Theories in their bearing upon Evangelical Theology. The Committee may also appoint a subject connected with the practical work of the Ministry as subject of Lecture, but in no case shall this be admissible more than once in every five appointments.

IV. The appointments to this Lectureship shall be made in the first instance from among the Licentiates or Ministers of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, of whom no one shall be eligible, who, when the appointment falls to be made, shall have been licensed for more than twenty-five years, and who is not a graduate of a British University, preferential regard being had to those who have for some time been connected with a Continental University.

V. Appointments to this Lectureship not subject to the conditions in Section IV. may also from time to time, at the discretion of the Committee, be made from among eminent members of the Ministry of any of the Nonconformist Churches of Great Britain and Ireland, America, and the Colonies, or of the Protestant Evangelical Churches of the Continent.

VI. The Lecturer shall hold the appointment for three years.

VIII. The Lectures shall be published at the Lecturer's own expense within one year after their delivery.

IX. The Lectures shall be delivered to the students of the United Presbyterian Hall.

XII. The Public shall be admitted to the Lectures.

PREVIOUS KERR LECTURES

PUBLISHED BY MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK

MORALITY AND RELIGION.
By James Kidd, D.D. Price 10s. 6d.

THE CHRIST OF HISTORY AND OF EXPERIENCE.
By David W. Forrest, D.D. *Sixth Edition.* Price 6s.

THE RELATION OF THE APOSTOLIC TEACHING TO THE TEACHING OF CHRIST.
By Robert J. Drummond, D.D. *Second Edition.* Price 10s. 6d.

THE SACRAMENTS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.
By J. C. Lambert, D.D. Price 10s. 6d.

THE TESTS OF LIFE.
By Prof. Robert Law, D.D. *Second Edition.* Price 7s. 6d. net.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL
UNDER THE KINGDOM

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL UNDER THE KINGDOM

THE KERR LECTURES, DELIVERED IN THE UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW DURING SESSION 1911–12

BY THE

Rev. ADAM C. WELCH, Theol.D.

AUTHOR OF "ANSELM AND HIS WORK"

Edinburgh: T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street

1912

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

DER THEOLOGISCHEN FAKULTÄT
DER UNIVERSITÄT HALLE
FÜR DIE (JUNI 1909) MIR VERLIEHENE
DOKTORWÜRDE
IN DANKBARKEIT GEWIDMET
VOM VERFASSER

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY 1

CHAPTER II.

THE STORIES OF JE 8

CHAPTER III.

PROPHECY BEFORE AMOS 33

CHAPTER IV.

AMOS 59

CHAPTER V.

HOSEA 97

CHAPTER VI.

ISAIAH 144

CHAPTER VII.

DEUTERONOMY 192

NOTES 243

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES 293

INDEX OF SUBJECTS 300

PREFACE.

A COURSE of lectures on so large a subject as the Religion of Israel under the Kingdom must necessarily omit, and the only problem is not to omit anything essential to the general picture. What, therefore, one elects to omit must be determined by the view taken of the course of development of Hebrew thought during the period under review. I have sought to point out how, under the kingdom, prophecy with its wider ideals and the nation with its narrower outlook at first support each other, but finally separate, and how their interaction makes each more conscious of its peculiar task. The omissions are determined by the line of treatment.

One omission a glance over the headings of the chapters will at once show. There is no separate treatment of Micah and Zephaniah, though these two prophets did their work during the period of the kingdom. Because Micah supplies little that is distinctive to the development which is the subject of the lectures, I have thought it unnecessary to overload the book with a special study of his prophecy, which would only repeat ideas that are more powerfully presented elsewhere. It is true that thereby the theory of the development of Israel's religious thought loses the confirmation of the support of an additional witness. Zephaniah, again, has a much more distinctive message; but, since his thought forms one of the points of transition to the wide ideals of Deutero-Isaiah, and thus leads to a new field, I have judged

it wiser to retain a monograph on his prophecy, and have merely used his message to make clearer the conceptions and to illustrate my view of Amos.

Another omission will appear to any student of the book. The sacrificial system must have contributed to the Religion of Israel many and deeply important elements. I have not offered any separate treatment of the system, though I have found it necessary to refer to it frequently. We can best understand the influence of the sacrifices when we determine the main lines along which the religious life of Israel developed. I have sought to determine the leading factors in that main line of development.

It may be useful to state here that I believe the two separate accounts of J and E were written under the early kingdom, possibly even under the united kingdom, and were united as JE, while the Northern kingdom still existed. More definitely than this it seems impossible to date them, and into the reasons for assigning these dates it is unnecessary to enter. Since, however, as I have developed in the Excursus following the second chapter, the accounts of Israel's history and Israel's religion contained in them were produced through the united activity of the priesthood and prophets in early Israel, they represent the faith in no individual or personal form. They rather gather up the view held by the best minds of the nation, and represent the stage at which the religious thought of Israel had arrived. The three great prophets follow ; individual and personal, they present their view of God and His relation to man and Israel. Their burden is the outcome of their personal experience, and in the light of an intimate experience they judge the temper and the institutions of the nation to which they are sent. In Deuteronomy we come to another anonymous book, which again represents the view of no individual, but that of the

body of religious men who have learned something from the prophets God sent them, and who seek, in the light of what they have learned, to remould the national institutions in such a way that these may more worthily express the prophetic message. Their failure to grasp the essential content of the prophets' message gives rise to the new movement of prophetic activity and priestly ritual; but that movement leads us into the exile.

JE, then, in its present form offers the consensus of opinion of the religious leaders of Israel and embodies the stage of religious thought at which Israel in its best minds had arrived. The prophets presuppose it and advance from it to a deeper and wider view of the relation between God and man which it implies. The Deuteronomists built upon an accepted position and sought to remould it in the interests of admitting the prophets' criticism. Except the religion had deep roots, it is impossible to understand Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. Except the foundations had been broadly based and securely laid, it would have been impossible to build as men built in Deuteronomy. I have endeavoured to make these lectures a strict historical study of the period to which they refer, and have deliberately refrained from entering into the question as to what is implied in that position. But the renewed study of the period has only confirmed my conviction that the great figures Hebrew tradition set at the beginning of its religious history are no mere reflexes of the later development, and that behind JE must lie a great past.

An adequate treatment of opposite views would have swollen the book to huge dimensions and made it almost unreadable to any except specialists: an inadequate treatment would have been an impertinence to other workers. I have thought it wiser to develop my own line

of thought and leave it to justify itself, and only in the notes to indicate opposite opinions. In the notes will be found also sufficient guidance for many who care to pursue the subject further or who find the positions in the text unsatisfactory. I have felt at times that the method seems unjust to work of patient quality, since such work deserves the respect of at least an attempted refutation. Yet one must recognise that, where opinions radically differ, the best method must be to state one's own conclusions with the grounds on which they are held, and to acknowledge, as I heartily do, how much one has learned in spirit and in actual conclusions from all honest work.

The method followed, of presenting my own view of Israel's religious development in the lectures, has made it necessary to increase the number of notes, and has determined the way in which they are presented. Instead of placing them at the foot of the pages, I have relegated the notes to the end, because I believe that the actual text can be read and followed without the distraction of being called off to read a reference at the foot of the page. Those who wish more than is given in the text will probably not resent having to turn specially to seek it.

I have not acknowledged all my debt to previous workers in this field of study, because, in a literature which has reached huge dimensions, it was not always possible to remember. But, whenever the debt was one of which I was conscious, I have referred to its source, even at the risk of overloading the notes with references to other books. What has further prompted me to give such references is the recognition that a student, who has worked over a great mass of material, feels he has won a certain right, and even a duty, of sifting out for the benefit of his successors what has seemed to him of permanent value. Minor changes in the Hebrew

text, however, have been given without the name of the scholar who first proposed the emendation, because any good modern commentary supplies the want. There is an old, deep debt which I wish to acknowledge here—that to Heinrich Ewald. His results need revision, but his spirit is imperishable.

The Scripture references are to the chapters and verses in the Hebrew Bible. Several Hebrew words are transliterated in the text, because there is no exact equivalent for them in English. We can easily translate *qahal* as assembly, but *qahal* means the assembly of men who are qualified to take part in deliberation through their being partakers in the faith. It is better to be annoyed by reading *qahal* than to be misled by reading assembly and carrying into our understanding of the word the associations which cling to us round the English word.

Finally, I have peculiar pleasure in acknowledging my indebtedness to three old friends : to Rev. W. R. Thomson, B.D., for his patient interest in the lectures while they were in preparation ; and to Prof. J. W. Oman, D.D., and Rev. B. R. H. Mein, M.A., for their careful reading of the proofs and for their suggestive and sympathetic criticism of the line of argument.

Glasgow, 1912.

RELIGION OF ISRAEL UNDER THE KINGDOM.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

For the subject of these lectures I have selected the Religion of Israel under the Kingdom. I have omitted, however, the great figure of Jeremiah, though chronologically he belongs to this period, because with him opens a new movement in Israel's religious development. When Jeremiah begins the most fruitful part of his work, the shadow of death is already over the Jewish State as a State: and, with the passing away of the State, religion in Israel came to possess the power and the limitations of a convent-bred faith. Exilic and post-exilic Israel, in order to preserve its peculiar treasure, turned its back on the world and deliberately cut itself off from the movement of life which produced, among much else, the Hellenic civilisation. Through this self-limitation it gained a great deal; to mention but one thing, it created the devotional literature of the world. But men cannot construe the religious life as a thing apart, and strictly separate it from the problems raised by their life

in the outer world, without losing much for the faith itself. The Church in its independent activity is necessary to the wholesome life of the State; but the State is equally useful to the wholesome life of the Church.

Now it is this constant interplay between the religious and the secular life of Israel which characterises the period of the kingdom, and indeed makes the period unique in the national history. How largely this is the case and how much is involved in it will, I hope, become clear through this study of the religion of the period. Meantime it is to be observed that the kingdom owed its inception to the faith. Though the first impulse to the gathering of the tribes under one leader came from the purely secular necessity of making head against the Philistines, nevertheless the people found their rallying point and their strongest support in their religion. A prophet of Jahveh gave the sanction of the faith to the first king, and ever afterwards the king was recognised as the anointed of Jahveh. Thus in the blessing of Moses, a very early document, the kingship is represented as a crowning gift from Jahveh (Deut. xxxiii. 5); and in another period Jahveh is represented as having sanctioned the new governor by bestowing His spirit on the king (1 Sam. x. 6, xvi. 13). That this conception of the office is no mere reflex of the glory of the Davidic house, but is regarded as something which attached to the king as such, is to be seen from the statements which represent the kings of Northern Israel, no less than those of the house of David, as reigning in Jahveh's name and deriving their authority from Him (1 Kings xi. 31 ff.; 2 Kings ix. 3). The religion, which had originally given the tribes the power to conquer Palestine and had preserved them in their first settlement, became the soul of their resistance to the risk of losing their identity in Palestine, and lent its support to the unity of the nation and the organisa-

tion representing this unity, which had been found necessary to maintain the land they had won.

The first effect of the new unity which had come to the people and of the success which attended their assertion of it, was a confidence in their power and a new consciousness of their distinctive part in the life of their world. How strong was the impression which this period made on men's minds is to be seen not merely in the extent to which the story of the early kingdom bulks in their annals, but in the verve with which that story is told. The annals of the later kings are jejune; they rarely expand into a record which contains human personality and interest. Only once in Hebrew records is secular history told with the colour and instinct for human personality which make us say that thus the men acted and thought; and this is in the time of Saul and David. In all that story, but particularly in the story of Absalom's rebellion, the Hebrew writers produce what on the purely secular side can take its place among the great literature of the world. The nation was reborn, and in its new self-consciousness felt a keen delight in declaring what it had done and learned.

But, further, in this period their faith came to them as a new thing, since it was this which had given them their unity and distinctive character, and the power to maintain both against the world. This shows itself in many ways. Dr. Gray has pointed out how the use of Jahveh in proper names greatly increases at this time, and, what is specially noteworthy, increases most in the royal circles.[1] The kingdom was peculiarly conscious of being under the protection of Jahveh. The same close connection between the quickened national life and the quickened religious sense of the people makes its appearance in a still more significant, because more intimate, way. I have said that the later

annals of the kingdom are apt to be jejune. It can be added that they expand into something more than annals only when they touch upon the life of some prophet. The outstanding example of this is the cursory way in which the reign of Jeroboam II., in spite of its great political and social significance, is dismissed in the book of Kings, as compared with the relatively full details which are given of the reign of Ahab. It needed the intervention of the religious interest to make the annalists condescend into any detail as to the life-history of their kings, or to induce the historian to expand the bald statements of the annalists. In the early kingdom, on the other hand, when the religion and the outward life of the nation poured themselves into a common channel to seek a common end, men did not need the intervention of a prophet to make them realise that their God was guiding them in the aims they sought. They were able to write their secular history as a part of the religious record of the people.

In this period also they began to tell the story of how they came to be what they were, because their new sense of self-consciousness as a people roused their interest in their own past. Yet their fresh sense of what their faith had done to lend them a distinctive character and to give them power to assert it, determined the form in which they told their past. They told how they became a nation, and they told the story with the deep consciousness that to their faith they owed it that they were a nation at all. Because this was the case, the record of their past history became also the record of the faith to which they owed it that they had any history. Their faith was no dry series of theological tenets, it was the influence which had made them a nation and had guided their history. When they wrote about the faith, they must write about its work in the national life:

when they wrote their national story, they must write about the faith.

To the period of the early monarchy we owe the two accounts J and E, which relate the origins of the people and the origins of the faith which made them a people; and the period when these accounts were put into their present form helps us to understand the form itself. The first record, therefore, with which we have to do in a study of Israel's religion under the kingdom is found in these two accounts, in which were gathered a number of stories concerning the nation's past history. But it must be emphasised that what concerns us is not the originals from which the accounts have been derived. The stories themselves were old and came from different sources. What these sources were and what was the original form of the tales has been of recent years the subject of painstaking examination. On the one side, historical students, recognising in them the material for the national history, have submitted them to historical tests and, seeking to determine the original historical basis, have used them for a reconstruction of Israel's history.[2] On the other side, theological students, recognising that they show affinities with the mythology and religions of other races, have sought to elucidate their origin with the help of Comparative Religion.[3]

These questions as to the original form of the tales, the source from which they were derived, and the date at which their originals were composed do not directly concern us here. What does concern us directly is the form into which they were cast and the spirit which guided those who recast them. The questions of origin are important on other grounds, and have their bearing even on our present subject of inquiry. It deserves, however, to be emphasised that what gave JE the influence it possessed and still possesses is not

that which it has in common with the other faiths: what caused Israel to preserve the account and what forms its charm to men still is its simple and direct presentation of certain great religious truths which made Israel what it was and which it was Israel's glory to hold for the world.

To recognise that the stories have come from many sources and owe their origin to many minds and widely separated dates is to recognise also the power of the men who gave them their present form. For there is an impression of unity characterising the stories of the patriarchs which is irresistible. The process of analysis has been carried on with singular acuteness through many years, and emphasis has necessarily been laid on the diversity of the elements from which these final documents have been drawn. But, after one has recognised the justice of the analysis, and has convinced oneself of the diversity of the sources and the many-coloured traditions which meet here, the tales in their present form draw themselves together again and stand up in their direct simplicity to convey a very definite impression. It is this unity of impression, the peculiar contribution of the editors, which is our concern.[4]

To recognise, again, that the stories originally held points of contact with lower forms of faith, to reach behind their present form and see how there is often apparent in them a very different conception of the nature of God and of His relation to the world from those which later prevailed in Israel, is to recognise the power of their religion in the men who moulded and recast the accounts. They ventured to use material which came to them from other sources and to embody tales which show the influence of other faiths, because of the vigour with which they held their own. They show in this their confidence that their religion is broadly human and can answer the human necessities and

aspirations which found expression in these other faiths. They could tell about Jahveh what men had told about other gods, because Jahveh to them was all that and more than the other gods were believed to be. Israel has not yet gone into the cloister, from which it looks with suspicion on a world which lies under the power of the evil one.

Because this is so, the leading characteristic of these editors is not the fidelity with which they collected and transmitted all the material which came into their hands.[5] What characterises them is an extraordinary power to select what served their purpose, and to mould what they selected with a plastic skill which is the greater because it hides itself from view. There is nothing in the world which can compare with the story of Joseph. The men have taken stories which often owed their origin to a different conception of God and His relation to men, and, with a fearlessness which could only come from a simple and living faith, they have remoulded these so as to make them the vehicle for their own conceptions of Jahveh and His dealings with Israel.

CHAPTER II.

THE STORIES OF JE.

After what has been said in the introductory chapter, it will be recognised that the first task is to grasp the broad general convictions which underlie the early stories of Hebrew tradition, and which have given religious unity to the narratives. We can recognise the difficulty of the task and its delicacy, but we cannot escape from its necessity.

Thus the document is unhesitatingly monotheistic, in the sense that to its authors there is only one God whose will is of any significance or whose favour need be sought. The writers have no theory of the divine unity, but they are worshippers of one God. That other nations acknowledge other gods is of course known to them; but what these gods may be in themselves, or whether they have any real existence, is of no importance. While Jahveh can make Himself known to those who worship other gods (as in Gen. xii. 7), the other gods have no relation at all to those who worship Jahveh. Abraham is represented as having left his country in order to seek out a new land at Jahveh's bidding, but what he left behind him in the way of worship is not even thought of as interesting. Jahveh's presence and Jahveh's promises content him and reduce the past to a blank.

This assurance of there being but one God who is of any importance explains the absence of all warnings against idolatry. The later books are full of stern and repeated

warnings against this sin. Thus Deuteronomy condemns to death any one who seduces his brethren into idolatry (ch. xiii.). They are also full of safeguards which are framed to prevent the people from worshipping other gods. A great part of the legislation of Deuteronomy has this aim in view. Yet the world of this early book is heathen. Not only does Jacob spend many years in Paddan Aram, and Joseph live at the court of Pharaoh, but, when the patriarchs live in Palestine, they live among heathenism. Israel is not yet protected from paganism by the possession of a land of its own or by peculiar institutions which it has framed to embody and so safeguard its faith. In spite of this it is not felt to be necessary to say that the men remained loyal to Jahveh or to praise them for so remaining; the loyalty is taken for granted, as though nothing else were possible. So strongly does this run through all the narratives that the writers are unembarrassed in describing, in connection with the heroes of the faith, a tolerance which was inconceivable to a later age. Joseph marries one who is not merely an Egyptian, but a daughter of the priest of On (Gen. xli. 45); Jacob and Laban, who do not acknowledge the same God, unite in a sacrificial meal (Gen. xxxi. 54). When Jacob goes down into Egypt, it is the Egyptians who refuse to eat food in common (Gen. xliii. 32); and the author speaks of it as a curious custom.[1]

Against the monotheism of the document it has been held that the different places at which the patriarchs worship appear to mark, not merely different manifestations of the one God, but different Jahvehs; and the fact that special names for Jahveh emerge in connection with the local shrines has been used to strengthen this impression. (We have יהוה יראה, Gen. xxii. 14, cf. ver. 8; יהוה נסי, Ex. xvii. 15; יהוה שלום, Judg. vi. 24; אל אלהי ישראל, Gen. xxxiii. 20; אל בית אל, Gen. xxxv. 7, cf. xxxi. 13: we have

Jahveh called by different names, cf. אל עולם, Gen. xxi. 33, at Beersheba.) It has accordingly been urged that, even as there were as many Baals as there were places at which a Baalcult was practised, and as "the god Baal and the goddess Astarte are mythological abstractions from the fundamentally diverse Baals and Astartes of the local cults," [2] so Jahveh is the abstraction from the local Jahvehs which were worshipped at many shrines through the land. Even if it were proved that this is the case, it remains true that the abstraction has already been made. For Jahveh appears to Jacob in Paddan Aram (Gen. xxxi. 13), and reveals Himself as the God who had appeared at Bethel. At Bethel what Jacob saw was a ladder, the top of which reached to heaven (Gen. xxviii. 12). Jahveh may be expected at this sanctuary, but, when He comes to the worshipper there, He comes down. He is a visitant, not the *numen loci.* As He may come to Bethel, so He came down on Sinai (Ex. xx. 24, iii. 8, xix. 11, 18); and though Sinai was long regarded as His dwelling-place, 'even yon Sinai' quakes when Jahveh arrives (Judg. v. 5).[3]

All this implies that Jahveh is a free personality, who is bound to no place, but is able to reveal Himself where He will, and who is only determined by His own will when He thus reveals Himself. The sacrifice of the worshipper is not the means by which he draws the attention of his God or even attracts His presence: it is the means by which the worshipper gives thanks for a revelation which has been of God's free grace to him. Jahveh can make His will both known and effective in Paddan Aram, in Palestine, in Egypt; and wherever He has made Himself known, His worshippers have found in Him all they need. This is not theoretical monotheism, which abstracts the thought of God and the other gods to reason about the divine nature; but it is that worship of one

God without which the most finely reasoned monotheism is apt to remain merely theoretical.

Jahveh is also spiritual, in the sense that His relation to nature is that of a free personality. One prefers to say His relation to nature rather than to the universe, because the book does not bring Jahveh into a close connection with creation, and does not conceive Him as holding a definite relation to the world as a whole. Possibly the idea of the world as a whole has not risen before the thought of the writers; certainly, if it has, it does not bulk largely in their minds, for Jahveh's relation to the world is not conceived as a relation to the world-whole, but rather as a relation to the individual nature-phenomena and especially to the terrible aspects of nature which have always attracted men's awe.[4] Now, when Jahveh brings earthquake and storm, He always stands behind the nature-phenomenon, and is never contained in it. The very variety of events with which He can be brought into connection is the sufficient proof that He is identical with none. He sends pestilence (Ex. ix. 8, 2 Sam. xxiv. 15), and causes drought (Gen. xli. 25–32); He rains down fire (Gen. xix. 24), and is attended by earthquake (Judg. v. 5). If Jahveh were conceived as the god of the storm, it would be difficult to account for His association with pestilence. The fact that He is associated with all these natural events shows that He is contained in none, but is conceived as able to use each in order to fulfil His will. These events, however, play a singularly slight part in the conception of God which appears in the stories of the patriarchs. Jahveh can manifest Himself through these phenomena, but in general He manifests Himself to the patriarchs without them. If, therefore, they appear as attending Jahveh in certain parts of the story, it is a just conclusion that these phenomena of nature which have always roused men's interest, especially

at a certain stage of their mental and religious development, claimed the attention of the Hebrews also as subjects for religious thought, were referred by them to the one God of the people, and could not be conceived by them as escaping, any more than aught else, from His control.[5] The significant matter is that they are always believed to be under His control. Jahveh's relation to the cosmos, and especially to the nature-phenomena, has not been a subject of reflection; but Jahveh's nature is so conceived and so thoroughly held aloof from being contained in nature that the people are sure, when the period of reflection comes, to follow the higher line of theological thought.

The spirituality of Jahveh is also clearly shown in His relation to the sanctuaries. A common reason assigned for the selection of certain places as those in which a revelation was granted to the patriarchs is that they were the centres of a Canaanite cult, to which the Israelites, when they conquered the land, attached themselves. The patriarchs are then represented as having been brought to these places in order, as it were, to sprinkle an alien sanctuary with holy water and carry over to the uses of Jahveh sites and practices which originally belonged to other gods. The theory has, in reality, little foundation.[6] The only places about which we definitely know that they were alike patriarchal places of worship and centres of a later cult are Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 19, cf. Amos v. 5, etc.) and Beersheba (Gen. xxvi. 23–25, cf. Amos v. 5, etc.). But Mamre (Gen. xviii. 1), Penuel (Gen. xxxii. 31), and Mahanaim (Gen. xxxii. 2 f.) are all places where a revelation is reported to have been given to the forefathers; and none of these has any except secular associations for later Israel. On the other hand, Shiloh, the famous seat of worship during the early kingdom (Judg. xxi. 19; 1 Sam. i. 3), Gilgal, which was associated with Joshua's victories (Josh. iv. 19 ff., v. 2–9,

cf. Hos. iv. 15; Amos v. 5), Gibeon, where Solomon had his high place of sacrifice and received his dream (1 Kings iii. 4 ff.), are all destitute of associations with the patriarchs. How little Israel in this early period was tied by the associations of a place, even when these associations were with its own past, is clearly shown in the case of Shechem. Shechem was a centre for religious solemnities to early Israel (Gen. xxxiii. 18–20, cf. Hos. vi. 9), but, though it was made the capital by Jeroboam, (1 Kings xii. 1, 25), and so received a religious and a secular importance, it was lightly forsaken by one of his successors for the stronger post of Samaria (1 Kings xvi. 24), and Samaria, which did not even exist in the days of the patriarchs, became the centre of a worship which threatened to rival that of Jerusalem. Further, it is certain that Israel did not in all cases adopt the sites of the rival worship from the Canaanites. Of recent years two places of Canaanite worship have been discovered, and the high places at Taanach and Gezer have been laid bare. Of Gezer, Prof. Macalister states that the sanctuary must have been so large and important as to form a landmark for all the district in which it stood. Yet neither of these places even appears in the patriarchal history.

When we find that most of the places in which Jahveh is declared to have revealed Himself to the patriarchs have no associations with any later worship, and that the only places about which it is independently certain that they had associations with Canaanite worship are ignored in the history, it is no unreasonable conclusion that what prompted JE to locate the patriarchal revelations at certain places was that these places were already by tradition connected with these great names, and thus had associations with the distinctive worship of Israel. This carries with it the further conclusion that the writers conceived their God as able and

willing to reveal Himself under conditions which He Himself, and not any place, imposed. He was a free spiritual personality, who was bound to no one place.

Hence, when the representation of this early ideal came to be framed into a law, it read (Ex. xx. 24), 'An altar of earth shalt thou make unto Me . . . wherever I cause My name to be remembered, I will come unto thee.' Jahveh does not dwell at, He comes to, the place of the cult.[7] And what determines Him so to do is Himself. The lawmakers not only retain[8] the primitive simplicity of the form of worship, they frame it into a binding rule that there shall be an earthen altar or at best one of unhewn stones; and their legislation seems a deliberate effort to avoid the elaborate Canaanite sacrificial apparatus with its inevitable suggestion of the god being confined there. The law was seeking to make a safeguard to the spiritual conception of Jahveh, but the spiritual conception was that which produced the desire for a safeguard.

The spiritual conception of the God whom men worship is purifying the relation between the deity and the worshipper, for the soul of the worshipper is becoming the medium through which Jahveh makes His will known. One hears, it is true, of altars in many places and of the *mazzeba* erected beside the altar (*e.g.* Gen. xxxv. 14). One catches a glimpse of the sacred well (Gen. xxvi. 25, 1 Kings i. 9), and the holy tree (Gen. xxi. 33). It is not difficult to understand how, in an age which had no clear doctrine of God's relation to the world, the obscure processes of the world's life were means through which God could reveal Himself; and men who still felt their life strangely akin to the life which filled the world, could look for the divine revelation in some natural objects in which nature manifests her secret life. That Israel could share these ideas is proved by the story

of how David expected a revelation of Jahveh's direction in the rustling of the baka trees (2 Sam. v. 24). But, though this may have been originally present in the patriarchal stories, it has almost wholly disappeared from them. The patriarchs hallow the place in which Jahveh has appeared to them: they do not consecrate any object which has been the medium of this revelation. Abraham builds an altar on which he gives thanks for the revelation of Jahveh, and by which he seeks to commemorate so great an event (Gen. xii. 7). Jacob sets up a *mazzeba* to distinguish the place in which he has found God present (Gen. xxviii. 16); yet the *mazzeba* itself is so insignificant that, when he returns to Bethel (xxxv. 7), he makes no use of it, but builds an altar. When Jahveh reveals Himself again, Jacob sets up a new *mazzeba* to mark afresh a place which has received a fresh distinction.[9]

The attitude which the document takes is seen most clearly in the great figure which is set at the beginning of all the national faith. This faith takes its origin in the soul and in the resolution of Abraham; farther than that the author feels no need to go. The guidance which men need is not ministered to them in the dim processes of nature or in the stars; the heroes of Israel's faith walk in the light of their God's speech to them.

As less importance was attached to the outward means and more to the condition of the inward spirit, as the medium of the divine revelation was more and more felt to lie in the soul of the worshipper, the connection between the deity and the place of worship became more loose. The outward emblems became accessories instead of essentials for the worship. Hence it is possible for the two accounts to take different attitudes towards these emblems. E speaks of the *mazzeba* as a natural accessory of worship; J never alludes to it at all. Both have reached the position in which the

relation between Jahveh and His worshippers can exist without such outward things; but, while the one leaves it as a thing indifferent, the other removes it as unnecessary or even dangerous.[10] Because thought had already been directed to such questions and had brought into existence this body of opinion in Israel, a later generation, which found that certain emblems because of their resemblance to similar emblems among the heathen were assimilating the Jahveh-worship to the nature-religions, ordered their removal. Deuteronomy could order the *mazzeboth* to be removed and the *asherim* to be hewn down (xii. 3), without making a violent breach in the national religion, because the better religious thought of the people had long outgrown them.

The same convictions are seen to govern the thought as to what constitutes the relation between Jahveh and Israel. Jahveh can reveal Himself to others besides the patriarchs, and holds a relation, uncertain but real, to all men. Yet He reveals Himself to Laban and Pharaoh only in the interests of His own people. He holds a peculiar relation to the founders of Israel, which is based, not upon their acts, but on His free choice of them. In this also the spiritual character of Jahveh is emphasised.

It is highly significant to note that, according to both writers,[11] this relation is not instituted, nor is it even maintained by sacrifice. J does not regard sacrifice as a rite peculiar to Israel, for he was able to accept traditions which described Cain, Abel and Noah as presenting offerings; and so showed that he recognised sacrifice as something which existed before Israel existed. While he represents Abraham as building altars, he is accustomed to add that there the patriarch called upon the name of Jahveh (Gen. xxi. 33, xii. 8, xiii. 4). Evidently it was not the sacrifice, but the calling on the name of Jahveh, which seemed

to him to constitute the specifically Israelite element in this worship.[12] It were going too far to say that this implies a rejection of all sacrificial worship; it is not, however, too much to say that the writer conceives the faith as having originated in an act of Jahveh, and the relation between Jahveh and His worshipper as one which could continue without sacrifice; for it is exactly this latter statement which is made in the story of Joseph.[13]

The story is primarily concerned with a religious question, for its insistent theme is the great truth of the divine providence. Yet it is wholly silent as to sacrifice, and so far as this representation of the life of early Israel is concerned, the people at the period might have offered none. This silence, of course, is partly due to the fact that the principal action of the tale takes place in Egypt, and that Egypt was not regarded as a fitting place for sacrifice to Jahveh. The influence of this view of Egypt is proved by the fact that, when the Exodus is claimed by Moses, he gives as its motive that the people may go three days' journey into the wilderness and there hold a feast to Jahveh (Ex. v. 1). Evidently it was only in the wilderness that such a feast with its attendant sacrifices could be rightly celebrated. Yet how little force this had for the writer himself is indicated by his silence as to whether this feast was ever held. The broad fact remains that the life in Egypt, alike of Joseph and the people, though it is without sacrifice, is not regarded as destitute of the conscious presence of God. God reveals Himself to Joseph there. God's providence protects and guides the people there. The sons of Joseph, who have never seen an Israelite altar, are claimed by Jacob for the faith and blessed by him (Gen. xlviii. 5). Sacrifice is here relegated into a subordinate position as an unessential part of the Jahveh-worship. We understand better how Amos

found an audience when we recognise how, long before his time, there was a body of opinion in South Israel which held this view of the cult.

E shows a different attitude, which is equally instructive. He is interested in sacrifice and in the forms of worship at the high places: he recognises *mazzeboth* and likes to tell when and why they were planted.[14] But both writers are at one in the way in which they construe sacrifice. They regard it as a gift, never as a propitiation.[15] It is not a sacrament in the sense of being a means by which God's anger may be propitiated, or by which He who has withdrawn Himself from His people may be brought back. It is the acknowledgment on the part of the worshipper of the grace God has bestowed on him. Abraham sacrifices, after and because he has received a promise (Gen. xii. 7). The strange rite, described in ch. xv., is placed after the divine promise, and construed as a means by which God assures Abraham of His mercy.[16] Abraham is prepared to offer up Isaac, not as a means of renewing a weakened relation between God and himself, but at the bidding of Jahveh, *i.e.* as a recognition of their intimate relation (Gen. xxii.). Jacob anoints the stone and builds an altar at Bethel; but both acts follow and signalise a mercy which he has received (Gen. xxviii. 18, xxxv. 7), and in the latter Jacob gratefully acknowledges how Jahveh has made sure that the tie between them shall not be weakened.

This idea of sacrifice agrees with the fundamental virtue which is urged by the writers, loyalty to Jahveh as Israel's sufficient helper. Israel's sacrifices are the acknowledgment of this allegiance. They are offered at the recurrent festivals, when the nation comes to rejoice before Jahveh, 'none shall appear before Me empty'; they are offered continually on behalf of a nation which is about its daily work, like the

'bread of the presence'; they were offered at the individual's instance, when any man had special cause for a peculiar gratitude, like the vows and freewill offerings. But they are always thanksgiving: as men give tribute to their king, so they offer their tribute to their heavenly King.

This conception of sacrifice as an acknowledgment of mercy received means also that Jahveh is a free personality who gives His grace to a people whom He has chosen and who owes everything to Him. Israel does not seek to control, it lives under the free mercy of its God.

To do justice to this position, it is necessary to remember that, though the sacrifice of propitiation does not appear in JE, it does appear during the period at which the separate documents must have been written. Such a sacrifice is regarded as normal, when it is said in the case of Eli that the guilt of his house shall not be atoned with sacrifice or offering for ever (1 Sam. iii. 14), and when David asked Saul 'if Jahveh has stirred up the king against his servant, to present Him with an offering' (1 Sam. xxvi. 19). When David's act in taking the census was believed to have brought down plague upon the kingdom, the plague was stayed after the king had offered sacrifice (2 Sam. xxiv. 25). When the cause of another outbreak of the divine anger was discovered by the prophet to be the sin of Saul against the Gibeonites, seven of Saul's descendants were handed over to the Gibeonites to be hanged up for a sacrifice before Jahveh (2 Sam. xxi. 1–9). All these sacrifices are of the nature of offering something which may act as a constraint on Jahveh, and in particular the case of David with Saul points in the direction of the propitiatory sacrifice being construed as something which in some magic fashion acts on an anger which is capricious. With all such elements in the national religion these two documents will have nothing to do. The grace of God,

under which Israel lives and for which it gives thanks in its sacrifice, is uncompelled.

That the writers were deliberately submitting sacrifice to examination in the light of their ideas as to the God whom they worshipped thereby is shown in the attitude which E takes in connection with the sacrifice of Isaac. I do not think it possible to set this amazing chapter, Gen. xxii., too high, alike in its restraint of diction and in its spiritual insight. But, even because one realises how, like every work of creative genius, it is inexhaustible and is always supplying fresh thought to the new minds which study it, and to the new generations which inherit it, one must be on guard against importing modern ideas into its teaching. Our interest is concerned with construing it as a historic document which belongs to a special period of Israel's history.[17]

Isaac, then, is to be offered by his father, not as a propitiation for any sin (the view of child-sacrifice which is taken in Mic. vi. 7),[18] not as a means of averting the divine anger from the State (as in 2 Kings iii. 27), nor yet as a method of obtaining knowledge of the future (as in Deut. xviii. 10), but simply as a gift to Jahveh, and a proof of Abraham's close relation to Him. Accordingly, when Isaac is delivered, a ram is provided in his place, for it is fitting that the worshipper offer something of real value to his God.[19] Yet, even in the things which a man may offer in gratitude to his God, he must construe his offerings in the light of the nature of Him to whom they are offered; and, for no other reason than because Jahveh refused this thing, because Jahveh is what He is, such a sacrifice is forbidden to Israel.

This is the unique feature in the story as a part of Israel's religious history. Child-sacrifice disappeared in most of the

faiths at a certain stage of their development, because softened human manners revolted against it, or because the new sense of the child's rights as an independent personality and not a mere part of the family, made it seem unnatural. But men generally kept, as it were in the back of their minds, the sense that it was in itself an act of religion, and might in special circumstances be again required. In ordinary circumstances they substituted a doll for the child, or made the child's death into a mock death; but, because they believed that their God had a right to and a pleasure in this thing, the dark rite was always liable to return in its naked ugliness in the day of personal distress or national peril. Behind the delicate visions of Greek religion lurks the conception of God which made the sacrifice of Iphigenia possible and natural. Men, in their selfish terror or in their anxiety as to the State, could use such means as this to propitiate their God. And then a moralist like Lucretius could limn his picture of the delicate and virginal flesh in the hands of men made cowards by their superstition, and use this sacrifice as an indictment against religion which alone in all the national life tolerated so craven and so foul a deed. "Tantum potuit religio suadere malorum." In that contemptuous anger of a great moralist one feels the difficulty which troubled the life of the ancient world, the opposition between a morality which had grown sweeter and a religion which had not broken away from practices that represented the lower and earlier morality of the people.

Israel deliberately and consciously said that the God whom it worshipped refused such an offering.

It may appear as though I have dwelt too long on the attitude which these writers take to sacrifice, and as though the detailed discussion were needless in connection with a subject which may appear at most to be a side-issue. My

reason is double. On the one side, their whole attitude to sacrifice implies thought on Jahveh's nature and on that which constitutes Jahveh's relation to Israel, and the recognition of this forces on our attention strong elements in the national religion which gave the great prophets, in their severe criticism of the cult, their point of connection. Such a man as Amos becomes more easily understood. But, further, when it is recognised how the relation of Israel to Jahveh is conceived as something which was not called into being by the cult, and which could continue during a whole period of the nation's existence without sacrifice, it is evident that this relation was conceived as resting on a free act of Jahveh Himself which Israel's sacrifices gratefully acknowledged. It were going too far to say that the writers polemise against another view: their account does not read like a polemic at all. But it is only doing justice to their attitude to say that they instinctively revolt against that fundamental view which underlies all early propitiatory sacrifice and which brings it into close relation to magical rites, the view, namely, that man can control his God. Israel lives under the rule of a God by whose free grace its life is sustained. Their whole life, in other aspects than those which could be embodied in the cult, was under His direction.

So the first thing which is understood of every true worshipper of this God is that he acknowledges no other allegiance; his undivided allegiance is given to Jahveh. Abraham separates himself from home and kindred and commits himself to One who means well by him. Jacob may tolerate in his household certain idolatrous practices; but, when he goes on pilgrimage to Jahveh, he buries all these heathen emblems under an oak (Gen. xxxv. 4).[20] David's heart is perfect, because he worships Jahveh alone; Solomon's heart is not perfect, for he suffers other gods to have a place

at his court (1 Kings xi. 4). This is the primary virtue for these early writers.

We undervalue its significance, because we build on it. Since there is no other god who is likely to claim our allegiance, we fail to realise how much allegiance to one god has done for the moral culture of the race. But Warneck[21] has recently pointed out how large a space it occupies in the faith of all recent converts from heathenism. They are capable of grave moral failure, and, like the early Corinthians, are careless to visit with censure offences against the moral law. The one offence which they will not condone, to be capable of which is to be cut off at once from all Christian society, is apostasy. There must be only one allegiance.

So it is with early Israel. They do not conceive this as an obligation, they rather wear it as their privilege. They are not teaching how Jahveh is a jealous God, and so they do not fulminate against idolatry; but they are jealous of offering their service to any other. That means that the sense of being in the power of one Will, which means well by them, is a deliverance rather than a duty. It has delivered them from the fear of the dark powers which lurk in the processes of nature, before which man found himself so helpless. It has unified their moral life to realise that there is One above all these who has a purpose with them. Man is little and ignorant and weak; but over him is Jahveh who has a mind toward him. There is a sense of strong contentment which breathes through the record of early Israel, and which is the stronger because it contrasts with the stories of Paradise, of Babel, of the Nephilim, with their note of pessimism.

How men live, how they live together, how they bear themselves in the relations of their common life, are all brought into relation to Jahveh, for Jahveh cares about these

things. Jahveh is, as we might say, becoming the guardian of international ethics. He is invoked as witness of Jacob's conduct toward Laban's daughters, when Laban is not present to protect their rights (Gen. xxxi. 50 f.). He is the rewarder of those who practise common humanity (Ex. i. 20 f.). He holds a relation, vague and undefined, to all humanity, so that the report as to Sodom and Gomorrah rouses Him to inquiry into their conduct. When He comes down for this purpose, visits Abraham, and passes on to the cities of the plain, He tests both by their bearing to the two unknown visitants who come asking for hospitality. That for which Jahveh cares, alike in His chosen and in mankind, that for the absence of which in Sodom He destroys the city, is morality. Joseph puts away his temptation by the final sentence, 'How shall I do this great wickedness and sin against God?' (Gen. xxxix. 9).

One can be the more sure that the question of men's conduct to each other, the question of ethics, was present as determining in part the relation between God and man, if one puts away the idea that the early traditions regarded the nation as the unit in religion—whatever that may exactly mean—and could only conceive of Jahveh as holding a relation to Israel. It is true that the persons brought into relation to Jahveh are generally representatives of Israel, or, like Abraham's servant, concerned with the fortunes of the people. The same may be said of Jahveh making Himself known to Abimelech (Gen. xx. 3); that too is in the interests of the nation's future. But this common thread, on which the tales have been strung, has been contributed by those who collected them, and shows the purpose which they had in collecting them, namely, the purpose of telling how Israel arose through the help of its God. Yet, since the stories were once told independently of each other and of this common purpose,

what is revealed in them as to God's relation to certain men was told of His relation to them as men first and as representatives afterwards. When men heard the beautiful tale of Abraham receiving the heavenly visitors, they heard it first with no *arrière pensée* as to how this was the relation of Jahveh to Israel, but they heard through it the message 'be not forgetful to entertain strangers,' for through a gracious hospitality Abraham received heavenly visitors. "The story of how God heard the voice of the weeping child Ishmael is so touching simply because in it Jahveh has mercy on a child: this God will also hear the weeping of our children." [22] The man who wrote how, after Jahveh opened Hagar's eyes to see the well of water, she gave the boy drink, but did not add that she drank herself, was writing about a mother and wrote to the heart of all mothers. The collector who embodied the tale in the history was thinking of Hagar as the mother of a race, and of Ishmael as the representative of a people. That gave the reason for his retaining it, but no more. He could use, in order to describe Jahveh's relation to Israel, such stories of human pathos and virility, and adopt them without losing any of their rich human qualities.

That the morality of Israel at this early stage is primitive is only what we might expect. To take but one illustration: Jacob shows many of the Hebrew characteristics—shrewdness which degenerates into cunning, foresight which takes refuge in lying—and yet he is none the less under the peculiar care of Jahveh. Nay more, the stories are told with a verve which shows that these traits were relished by men who recognised themselves in their national heroes. But it is noteworthy that some of the stories were evidently raising scruples in this direction, for in some the more unworthy elements have been modified in the interests of a higher morality. Abraham's falsehood, in one variant of the story as

to Abimelech (Gen. xx. 12), is represented as a mental reservation. Personally I do not think this improves the situation; but I have found a number of Christian people who think it does, and am willing to suppose that this was a reason for the change. Jacob's dealings with Laban have evidently roused uneasiness, for his wives first and then Laban himself are required to justify his conduct (Gen. xxxi. 14–16, 43 f., xxxii. 1). Again, when one passes to the story of Joseph, there are few things which display a subtler knowledge of the shades of moral growth than the account of Joseph's dealings with his brethren. Their weakness and their strength, the care with which the denouement is brought about, not so as to surprise or to satisfy the desire for a rounded-off tale, but so as to satisfy the moral sense, the recognition of how the brotherhood which makes a nation is only indissolubly knit when the members are brought together into a moral unity, the recognition of the worth of repentance, the fine knowledge of the power of forgiveness, all these traits give evidence of a thought devoted to the springs of conduct which is amazing at any time. With this story before us, it is impossible to speak lightly of the moral development of early Israel.[23]

Early religion everywhere has put justice and right under the care of the god of the nation, and every code of social conduct has been represented as the expression of the will of the national deity and has been placed under his protection. This, which was true of all the nations of the time, is also true of Israel. But, even as we have seen how Jahveh was thought to care for the conduct of men as men, and not merely as Israelites, so the writers show that social morality has been thought of as something larger than tribal *mœurs*. The early tradition has one robust trait of true morality, it has no sense that the forefathers must, in relation to the rest of the world, be blameless. Foreigners are given a superiority

in this respect over Israel (cf. Abimelech and Abraham). Jacob is represented as having cursed two of his sons, Simeon and Levi (Gen. xlix. 5–7), for a wrath which was cruel against the foreigner. It was a later age which sought to justify their conduct (Gen. xxxiv.): the earlier morality was wider than patriotism. Jahveh has a concern with the morals of the world, for He visits Sodom to see whether it is as evil as He has heard (Gen. xix.). Yet Sodom has not sinned against Lot, nor is its presence imperilling the chosen seed. Its offence is against Jahveh (Gen. xiii. 13).

One general characteristic of these stories, as the editors have brought them together, deserves notice, because it is unique in the record of Israel's religion. The faith which they embody is that of a nation which is quietly confident of its place and its future, which is free from inward divisions save such as it can transcend, and which is reconciled with life, because behind its effort is the will of God, whom it serves with a happy and whole-hearted allegiance. This attitude expresses itself in scattered sayings like those which describe Abraham as the friend of God, or say of Moses that Jahveh spoke with him face to face. Although in these sayings we hear the wistful words in which a later generation, conscious of the division between itself and its God, described the happier relation of the past, they catch and embody the spirit which pervades the account and reaches its culminating point in the assurance of the Joseph-stories: 'Ye meant it unto me for evil, but God meant it unto me for good.' There is a divine Providence which governs the tangled affairs of this world, and even its moral conflicts, and which is unlimited in its power to bring about its own ends. There is only one Will in the world which it concerns Israel to know; and this Will is not recognised as a mere intervention in the course of the world, or known through the difference

between what it brings to pass and the ordinary events of life. God reveals His will in a course of events, of which man is the reverent spectator, not in any single event which stamps itself as divine through standing apart in quality or character from the rest of life. And about this will it is Israel's happy confidence that they know it and can do it. There is the quiet sincerity of men who are reconciled with life because they believe themselves in the hands of One whom they serve with a complete allegiance and who means well with them. Men are still only conscious of the liberty and enlargement which this sense of having to do with a mightier will than their own brings with it: they have not yet learned either their own impotence to fulfil all the demands of Jahveh, or the inward conflict which such an effort brings with it. Abraham receives a revelation and is competent to fulfil it all. The demand is simple and outward: the response is instant and complete. Man's will is free and strong enough to do what his God requires.

Never again do we catch this note in the main line of Israel's religion. The nation was caught up into the world-movement without, and was divided against itself within. It had to fight for the faith that there was any world-purpose at all, and, in the effort to assert what this world-purpose claimed, it became divided within. The prophets spoke to the nation, but found that only the faithful would listen. 'Rejoice not, O Israel, exult not like the nations,' said Hosea (ix. 1).[24] And Israel never could rejoice again with the naïve gladness which breathes through its early records. Under the stern discipline of experience and the teaching of the prophets, this hopefulness of heart passed away from the people as a people to give place to something deeper. Some one has said that the records of Genesis form an epic, while the later records form a tragedy. That is no inadequate

description, for the people as a people was never again reconciled with life.[25]

Excursus on the Authors of JE.

The most probable supposition as to the source of these stories is that they received their present form in one or more of the priestly circles and at one of the leading shrines. This would account for the fact that the patriarchs are frequently brought into connection with places at which a later organised worship existed: the writers made use of the stories which were current at these sanctuaries. It may, however, appear to militate against such a view that it requires us to suppose that a document like J, which shows a comparative indifference to all sacrifice, originated among the priests, whose business, we are apt to conceive, was to carry on the sacrifices. It is necessary, therefore, to recognise that both the character and the work of the priesthood underwent a profound change during the course of Israelite history.

On the one hand, the early priesthood had much less to do with the offering of sacrifice than came later to be the case. The sacrifices in the early period were more simple in themselves and less elaborate in their accessories, and they seem to have been frequently performed by the housefather or by the head of the clan. Saul offered sacrifice for the people, and was not rebuked for his act in this connection (1 Sam. xiii. 8–14; cf. xiv. 32–35). Solomon arranged the sacrifices which were offered at Gibeon, and in Jahveh's name blessed the people who were gathered there (1 Kings viii. 5, 55). It may be said that Saul and Solomon were kings and that the character of their office gave them a peculiar position, so that their being allowed to perform sacrifice does not carry with it as an inevitable conclusion that this was a layman's function. But Micah (in Judges ch. xvii.) sets apart one of his sons as priest in the new sanctuary which he has instituted. It seems natural that the owner of the sanctuary with all its appurtenances should appoint the priest who shall take charge

of this; but it also seems natural that he should appoint any one whom he can find. When a wandering Levite makes his appearance, Micah is well content to put him in charge of the sanctuary, but, while he feels surer of the character of his worship now that he has a Levite as his priest, he as evidently did not think that the presence of one of his sons as priest would invalidate all its character. When, again, the Danites went out to find a new settlement, they congratulated themselves on having secured a descendant of Moses whom they could take with them to supervise their tribal sanctuary (Judg. xviii. 19, 30). But there is no reason to suppose that they would have abstained from sacrifice altogether if they had been unable to find such an official representative.

The priests at the great sanctuaries officiated, as in the case of Eli and his house in Shiloh, at the annual and stated festivals, but seem to have been counted unnecessary for the minor sacrifices. It was only when sacrifice and holy place came to be provided with a theory as to that which gave them efficacy that official ministrants became essential.[26]

On the other hand, a leading function of the early priesthood was to pronounce the law and to issue legal decisions in the name of Jahveh. In the Blessing of Moses the chief task of the priests is to teach Jacob Jahveh's judgments and Israel Jahveh's law (Deut. xxxiii. 10). Their chief glory is to have fulfilled this function without fear or favour, while their functions in connection with sacrifice are put in the last place. And that Jahveh's law which the priests announced was not a series of merely ritual precepts dealing with the correct method of offering the sacrifice is proved by the cases which were referred for decision to the local sanctuary. Causes which were found too hard for the elders in the gate were brought before Jahveh (Ex. xviii. 19). When a Hebrew servant accepted bondage for life, he did it at the sanctuary (Ex. xxi. 6). Eli says, that 'if one man sin against another, God shall give judgment on him' (1 Sam. ii. 25). The case was referred to the priests, who decided according to the ancient law, or, when the law was uncertain or the case novel,

administered the oath of purgation in the name of Jahveh (Ex. xxii. 10), or employed the holy lot.[27]

It agrees with the view represented in the Blessing of Moses as to the relative importance of sacrifice and law in the functions of the priesthood that the earliest code of Ex. xx.–xxiii. shows the same proportion. Ex. xx. 23–26 contains the law as to personal and clan sacrifices, and is content to reserve the altars for Jahveh alone and to ordain that they shall be simple, probably as a contrast with the high places of the Canaanites. Ex. xxiii. 14–19 ordains the three great festivals, in which the priests must have held a more prominent place, since these were more formal and were performed at the greater sanctuaries. The rest of the code is devoted to questions of personal and tribal law.

Throughout the Hebrew literature this sense that the priests have, as a large part of their function, the task of guiding the people in connection with questions of justice is never absent. Hosea is specially severe on the priests of Northern Israel because they have failed to do this very thing (iv. 1–8, v. 1); whereas when he speaks of the debased cultus, he addresses himself, not to the priests, but to the whole people. Even so late as Mal. ii. 1–6, the good old days were the days when the priest had the law of truth in his mouth and unrighteousness was not found in his lips.

Because this is the case, it is natural to expect that the prophets, who were also deeply concerned with righteousness and its divine sanctions, should be found in close connection with the priests. And this is exactly what we find. The early prophets live at Ramah in Mount Ephraim (1 Sam. xix. 18); Bethel (2 Kings ii. 3); Gibeah in Benjamin (1 Sam. x. 5, 10); Jericho (2 Kings ii. 5); Gilgal (2 Kings iv. 38). At all these places there was also a *bamah*, i.e. a sanctuary with its priesthood, to decide causes in the name of Jahveh, so that prophet and priest are brought into a local association. Samuel comes to the high place in order to bless a special sacrifice (1 Sam. ix. 13; cf. ch. xvi.). He began his ministry as a prophet at Shiloh when he was still in the service of

the ark there. An instructive hint regarding the close relation between the prophets and the priesthood is to be found in the incident of the Shunammite woman. She has resolved to carry her case to the prophet. Her husband expressed surprise that she should, in the middle of the harvest-time, break off work for such a purpose, though it is neither new moon nor sabbath (2 Kings iv. 23). On one of these major festivals when even harvest-work would have ceased, evidently the man would have counted it natural had she gone to consult a prophet. Here it is clearly taken for granted that the prophet was visited in connection with the holy days of the cult. So we find even the later prophets, in some cases priests themselves, in other cases supported by the priesthood. Jeremiah was of priestly stock; Ezekiel was a priest; Isaiah lived on at least friendly terms with the leading priests of Jerusalem.

The priesthood, during the troubled years before the kingdom arose, must have formed the centres of local justice; and, since the religion was the great influence which preserved a community of aim among the tribes, they must have been the chief supporters of the national life. At the festivals, which were celebrated at the sanctuaries, the people found not merely their religious, but their national sense quickened; and on every occasion when they sought a decision from the priest at the sanctuary they found themselves one in their mutual obedience to a law which was construed as the will of their national God. At these centres of the national life and the religious sense of the community the early prophets, who were the assertors of the individual and distinctive character of Israel's national life, and who were also the vehement opponents of all that conflicted with the social and moral life of their people, could still find themselves at home. When these considerations are duly weighed, one can understand how there was no more natural place than the great sanctuaries for a literature like this of JE, in which the religious and national aims of the people are still in harmony, and which breathes the spirit of a national self-consciousness based on broad and generous ideals.[28]

CHAPTER III.

PROPHECY BEFORE AMOS.

MEN have always found it easier to proclaim their faith in the will of their God as the sufficient guide of human life than to determine how this will is revealed for men's guidance and who are the fitting instruments for the supreme discovery. Yet the sincerity with which they utter the profession of their faith must always be measured by the sincerity with which they seek to answer the instant questions it raises. We have seen how religious men in Israel, when they wrote the story of the nation's beginnings, expressed the joyous confidence that the strength of all the past had lain in their fathers' obedience to Jahveh's will with them. How sincerely they faced the demand which was latent in this great profession is seen in the rise to prominence and influence of the prophet, for the specific task of the prophet was to reveal and to declare to the nation the will of Jahveh concerning the present and the future.

Throughout the period of the early kingdom prophecy is the one articulate voice of the Hebrew faith. I say 'articulate voice,' because, though the sacrifices were frequent and universal, and though their influence on the religious life of the people must have been very powerful,[1] they had not yet become the medium through which the distinctive character of Jahvism could express itself. At their best, the sacrifices were tolerant of the higher ideas of God and His relation to

His people, and could be interpreted in the light of the thoughts a devout worshipper brought to them; at their worst, they were also tolerant of the lower ideas. But of themselves the sacrifices did not supply the means by which the specific religious faith of Jahvism could find its voice: they could only offer a means by which the higher thoughts of Jahveh's nature might in time to come be brought home to the minds of common men. For the distinctive character of the faith it is necessary to look to the prophets, and it is therefore necessary to consider for a little the origin of the prophetic movement in Israel.

The origin of Hebrew prophecy has been sought among the Canaanites; and in some of its phenomena the movement shows great similarity to kindred religious movements among Eastern peoples. The ecstasy into which a prophet sometimes fell, the use of music to excite or soothe the prophet's spirit, the trance which occasionally accompanied his revelation, can all be paralleled with like phenomena in other faiths. But there are two considerations which warn against drawing too large conclusions from these admitted facts. The one is that the supposed explanation resolves itself into no explanation at all, since at best it is to seek to explain what is better known by what is less clearly known. However regretfully we must acknowledge the limitations of our knowledge as to the origin and history of Hebrew prophecy, we yet know more of its aims, its products and its history than we know of any similar movement among the Canaanites. For all practical purposes of useful comparison nothing is known about Canaanite prophecy. And the other consideration is that the appearance in connection with Hebrew prophecy of certain outward phenomena, which can be paralleled,—not merely from Eastern but from Western nations,—not merely from the eighth century B.C., but from the second century

A.D.,—suggests that these outward and attendant appearances belong to certain forms of religion which, because they answer to common human needs and widespread conceptions, are apt to appear whenever a people has reached a certain stage in its development. But these phenomena are capable of being associated with very different fundamental principles in the religions of the peoples in which they appear, and they develop very differently according to the inner principles that inform the religion of which they form one of the manifestations.[2] It is not the outward phenomena prophecy has in common with the mantic in another religion which are of peculiar significance for the knowledge of Israel's religion: it is the aims to which these phenomena were made subservient, in obedience to the spirit of the religion of which they were a transient manifestation.

Nor does the derivation of the name which came to be applied to the Hebrew prophet give much help in determining his specific task.[3] The *nabhi* may be simply the outpourer, who gives out what the God, with whom he holds communion, has supplied to him. But the divine communication may be a judgment on the past, a direction for the present, or a prediction of the future. It may be any of these according to the character and the power of the God in whose name the prophet speaks, or according to the aim which sends the prophet in search of the divine guidance. To determine the nature of his function, we are thrown back on the inner spirit of the religion of which prophecy is one manifestation; and we must find this in what prophecy set itself to do, and, as a matter of fact, did do, in Israel.

How little the Canaanite religion contributed to the essential features of prophetism may be concluded from the fact that the prophet appeared most prominently in Israel when the people united, under the inspiration of their religion,

to cast off the foreign yoke. Samuel roused Saul to a sense of the national need, and though Samuel in the early account is not brought into close connection with the prophetic schools, he sent Saul to them.[4] Evidently the national cause found its strongest support in these circles. In the same way the later redaction of Barak's victory represented Barak as powerless till he had come into contact with Deborah the prophetess (Judg. iv. 8), and so expressed its conviction that the physical force of the nation found its soul and its rallying cry in the national faith as represented by the prophets.[5] The prophet was regarded as one of the influences which united Israel against the foreigner and supplied the national cause with its inspiration. And Amos at a later date counted the rise of prophets in Israel a gift from Jahveh (ii. 11), as real and great a gift as when Jahveh gave Israel the land of the Amorites.[6] These facts carry the conclusion that Hebrew prophecy had its essential roots in the Jahveh-faith, and that the surest conclusions as to its aims and convictions can be gained through the examination of its own methods and results.

Now the primary characteristic which marks all Hebrew prophecy is its claim to be able to foresee the future and to foretell something of what Jahveh was about to do in Israel and in the world. In a very early period, the attitude of Saul's servant, so soon as he knows that there is a *ro'eh* in the neighbourhood, shows the popular estimate of the prophet's function. And, while it is true that Samuel puts the whole matter on a higher plane, while he quiets Saul's anxiety as to the strayed asses in order to leave him free to devote his attention to the larger question of the nation, and while he predicts what is to happen to Saul in order to bring him into contact with the men who have the national cause at heart, he does yet, in point of fact, claim the knowledge that

the asses have returned and foretells what shall happen to Saul on the following day. These matters are brought into connection with Jahveh's purposes for Saul, and through Saul for Israel; but, so far as they serve that end, they are regarded as within the knowledge of the prophet.[7] What thus marks prophecy in its beginning characterises it during all the period when it remained a living force within the national life. There are individual cases, such as that of Nathan, where this feature of the prophet's work sinks out of sight and allows his other functions to appear with much greater prominence. But these cases occur in connection with prophets as to whose life-work we are somewhat meagrely informed. Wherever the life-history of a prophet, as *e.g.* Elijah or Elisha, is more largely detailed, wherever his utterances, as *e.g.* those of Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, are more liberally reported, this element in his work not only appears, but appears in the foreground. For Amos is able to say about the prophets: 'Jahveh will do nothing without revealing it to His servants, the prophets' (iii. 7). Deuteronomy is able to make the test of whether Jahveh has sent a prophet to consist in the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of his predictions (xviii. 21 f.). Deutero-Isaiah is never weary of insisting that the proof of the greatness of Jahveh who is restoring Israel lies in the fact that He foretold long ago what He was about to do (xli. 21 f., xliv. 7, 26 ff., xlv. 21). The prediction of the future is a constant element in Hebrew prophecy.

The day is past when it is legitimate to rationalise such a primitive belief as this; and what is necessary is rather to seek to recognise what it represented in the early thought of Israel. For one thing, it meant that Jahveh was conceived as a free personality, who is not contained in any of the natural phenomena of the world, but who can control them all. Because this is so, even such purely contingent

events as earthquake or pestilence, famine or war, appear among the matters which a prophet can predict. Gad offers David the choice between seven years of famine, three months of defeat, and three days of pestilence (2 Sam. xxiv. 13). He can offer these in the name of Jahveh, because they are at Jahveh's command to fulfil His ends. All these things are to Israel in the hands of its God, and so thoroughly in His hands that, since He brings them to pass (Amos iv. 6 ff.), He can also let it be known when He means to bring them to pass (vii. 1–3, 4–6). The Hebrew makes no distinction among events; all things, even contingent events, are in the hands of one great Will.

Again, the prophet's power to foresee the future means that Jahveh governs all things in order to bring about His own purpose; and this purpose is especially working itself out in the history of His own people. Jahveh has a purpose, and He can order events in such a way that they shall remove what is hindering it, as in the case of Sodom and Gomorrah, or in such a way that they shall further those who serve it, as in the case of Joseph. His intervention in human life is not capricious, and, because it is not capricious, He does not conceal it, but reveals it through His prophets. To know how irresistible this divine purpose is, and to know oneself a sharer in it, is to have a buoyant confidence in life. To see beforehand what Jahveh is bringing to pass is to be prepared for it and able to welcome it. But, when one sees how, even in so simple a story as that of Samuel and Saul, the prediction of contingent events is made subordinate to the greater aim which is beyond, one recognises how behind prophecy lies this dictum of faith in Jahveh's government of His world, within which nothing falls out that He has not known.

It is illuminating as to what this means to recognise that

the same phenomenon appears in early Christianity. That too came upon a distracted world as the discovery of how the universe is not divided between warring powers, but is controlled by one Will towards one issue, which men believed they saw. Tatian gives, as the final appeal which Christianity made to him and which determined his conversion, its *μοναρχία*,[8] *i.e.* its sense of the unity of the world in the hands of an infinite and spiritual and gracious power. Men who accepted this were reconciled with life as something which in the end meant good for them. Forthwith there sprang up in the early Church the prophets. And that these prophets were conceived as able to foretell the future, and in that future purely contingent events, is shown by the example of Agabus, who foretold a famine (Acts xi. 27 ff.), and predicted the captivity of St. Paul (xxi. 10 f.). St. Paul himself was able to declare that no loss of life was to attend the storm which befell him on his way to Rome, but that the ship was to be cast on a certain island (xxvii. 22–26). The prophetic phenomena soon died out of the early Church, largely because the Church had a deeper sense of that which it supremely concerned men to know as to the future. But this deeper sense in them was largely the outcome of the travail of the Hebrew faith, as it sought to know what it behoved God to reveal. All this was one part of what prophecy in its history had to learn and teach.

Into this, of course, it is impossible to enter here: but it is important to mark that from its beginning prophecy claimed to know what Jahveh was about to do in Israel and for Israel; that this claim was the expression of its faith in Jahveh as a free personality, who was governed by no caprice but who had a purpose to fulfil in the world; and that all which it was necessary for Israel to know of His

purpose Jahveh should reveal in His own time through His servant, the prophet.

In so far as Israel believed that it was possible to learn the will of Jahveh, a will which determined the future and governed the present, Israel was not different from the other nations. Every nation which has any real faith in its god's care of its fortunes, has also believed in the possibility of learning its god's will in order that it may satisfy his demands. The difference has shown itself in the methods by which they believed that the god's will could be learned; for the method of reaching the knowledge of the divine will implies a view of the nature of the god and of his relation to his worshippers. The rise of prophecy in Israel is the proof of how spiritual the nature of Jahveh had become, since the weight is laid upon the soul of man as the medium of Jahveh's revelation. Hence prophecy, from the beginning,—and with greater clearness as it grew conscious of itself and of its functions,—made an instinctive protest against rites which existed in other nations and some of which had already existed among its own people.

Thus the rise of prophecy coincided with a revolt against witchcraft and necromancy: and its later development made this protest more reasoned and conscious. Saul already sought to put down all such practices in Israel (1 Sam. xxviii. 9); the earliest legislation abruptly commanded 'thou shalt not suffer a witch to live' (Ex. xxii. 17); and Deuteronomy enters into a catalogue of such rites in order to set them under the ban (xviii. 9–13).

The attraction these rites exercised on men's minds arose from the fact that they offered a means by which men might wring from the gods a knowledge of the future. But, as they were practised in Israel, they also contained an acknowledgment of the gods of the underworld, who were able to reveal

the future because they controlled it. Hence they offended on two sides the instinct of the prophets. They did violence to the monarchic element in the Hebrew faith. Exodus forbids a witch to live, because her offence is one against the religion of Israel; Deuteronomy shows that these practices are heathen and imply the worship of another god, for it closes the denunciation of them with the statement: 'thou shalt be wholly devoted to Jahveh thy God' (ver. 13). But, besides this revolt against necromancy as a form of idolatry, there is present the revolt against the idea that, even when they are practised without an idolatrous reference, it is possible through these rites to control Jahveh. At the bottom of necromantic arts lies the belief that man, through knowledge of the divine name or through other secret knowledge, may control the gods and compel them to his will. And, as Jahvism in the interests of religion put aside propitiation, so it put aside necromancy. Religion to it meant that Jahveh came when He willed, and in His loving kindness made known what His people needed to know. Deuteronomy, not content to denounce necromancy, proceeds to point out how the nation's own religion satisfies by the prophet the want to which such practices appeal (vers. 14 ff.). And what is thus expressly stated in Deuteronomy—namely, the needlessness of such rites in Israel—is already referred to in the early saying which is put into the mouth of Balaam (Num. xxiii. 23): 'there is no enchantment in Jacob, neither is there any divination in Israel; at the right time it is said to him what God doeth.'[9] Here the superstitious rites are not so much forbidden as they are recognised to be needless. Israel lives under the guidance of the sovereign will of One whose august and irresistible purpose is made known whenever it is necessary. The higher means by which God's will can be learned is thrusting into the background and treating with contempt the baser method.

And this attitude of contempt is emphasised in connection with Saul's visit to the witch of Endor. Evidently witchcraft is recognised as possible: there are witches, and their power is real. But, when the woman by her arts succeeds in bringing up one from the realm of the dead, she brings up Samuel, the prophet who, while he lived, had taught the king the will of Jahveh. And he comes back only to repeat what he had said in his lifetime; for in the dim world of the shades there is only one will which governs all things, and when men pierce into the secrets of that country and think to escape from Jahveh, they find Him again and hear the same message. The futility, rather than the sin, of such means of learning the future is the salient feature of the story. Jahveh offers His guidance through more worthy means. As JE taught that, because Jahveh is spiritual, He is to be found, not in outward emblems but in the soul of man, so prophecy claims for man the power to declare the will of God.[10]

A further result of the rise of prophecy was to drive into the background the method, common hitherto, of inquiring as to the will of Jahveh through the priestly lot. The urim and thummim were in the hands of the priests, and formed a means by which cases which were too hard for decision in the ordinary way were directly referred to Jahveh. In Deut. xxxiii. 8, a very early document, the possession of these means of learning the divine will is referred to as forming the peculiar glory of the priesthood. The sacred lot is also found in use during the period of Saul (1 Sam. xiv. 37 ff.) and David (xxiii. 9 ff.). From this time it disappears, and its disappearance coincides with the rise of prophecy.[11] The change which came over Israel's custom at this time has been noted by some one who inserted in the account of Saul's visit to Samuel the

remark, 'Beforetime in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, thus he spake, come and let us go to the seer, for he that is now called a prophet was beforetime called a seer' (1 Sam. ix. 9). The glossator wished to explain to readers of the Book of Samuel that they will best understand the position and the functions of the seer in early Israel if they remember that these were practically the same as those which belonged to the prophets of their own time. But he further noted, as something which began in the time of Samuel and continued into his own, that men in Israel turned to seers or prophets for direction and forsook the habit of consulting Jahveh through the oracle.[12] The opposition between prophecy and the oracle could never be so sharp as the opposition between prophecy and necromancy, for the men who used the oracle inquired of Jahveh by its means. But prophecy, with its more spiritual conception of the relation between God and man, thrust into the background the less spiritual medium by which God's will was learned.

Still more significant is the way in which prophecy quietly removed the ark from the position which it had hitherto occupied. I call this more significant, because, while the sacred lot was a means of consulting the divine will which was common to Israel and the other nations, the ark was a specifically Israelite emblem which had associations only with Jahveh. The fact, therefore, that prophecy puts the ark into a subordinate place forms the proof that prophecy brought not merely the means of accentuating the distinctive features of Jahvism, as over against alien rites and foreign emblems, but a development and clearer consciousness of itself within the national religion.

Now the ark was construed as the throne of the invisible Jahveh; and its presence was regarded as the guarantee of that more august presence.[13] Hence its loss to the

Philistines seemed to many to imply the utter downfall of the nation's hopes: the glory of Israel is gone when the ark of God is taken (1 Sam. iv. 22). But the remarkable feature about the whole story, and the one which has received least attention, is that the loss of the ark implies nothing of the kind. After the ark has been taken, and long before its recovery seemed in the least degree likely, the nation has rallied itself, and rallied itself on its religion in the person of its prophets. Samuel is able in the name of the faith to appeal successfully to Saul, and so to all Israel. The religion, in the person of the prophet, has not fought down the idea that Jahveh could be bound to the presence or the absence of a box. It has done a much greater thing: it has proved that it can stand without this crude emblem, and so proved it unnecessary.

From this time forward, so far as its original sense is concerned, the ark disappears out of the national life.[14] Saul, who has found his inspiration in another source, never troubles to inquire about it. It reappears under David, for the new king, wishing to mark his final triumph over the Philistines, and to gather into his new capital some of the older associations of the religious and national life, brings it up to Jerusalem. But, despite the prodigies which attend its transference, it disappears in its old form of the throne of Jahveh. So wholly has its original meaning been forgotten, and so utterly have its earlier associations faded away, that Deuteronomy was able to use it as the place beside which the decalogue was stored. When an emblem is made into a chest for holding something else, it is dead. Prophecy first made the ark unnecessary and then used it to hold its own symbol of God's guidance of Israel.

In prophecy the religion has found a means of self-expression, which has quietly made impossible many of the

old methods through which Jahveh and Israel were brought into relation. The spirit of man has become the lamp of the Lord.

But what qualified the prophet to be, what 1 Sam. ix. 6 calls him, the man of God κατ' ἐξοχήν? Here we are left in an uncertainty, which is not confined to us but which evidently obtained within Israel itself, for the existence of what are called false prophets can only be explained through the recognition that prophecy was divided within itself, if not as to its functions, at least as to its qualifications. There could not have been false prophets, exercising the influence they did exercise, had prophecy been able to set up a criterion which could infallibly try the spirits, whether they be of God.

The prophetic gift was closely allied with and attended by certain mental and even physical conditions. It was allied with music, the most non-moral and emotional of the arts. A prophet calls for a musician, and, when the musician plays with his hand, the spirit of Jahveh comes upon the prophet (2 Kings iii. 15).[15] The prophets, into whose company Samuel sends Saul, are accompanied by instruments of music (1 Sam. x. 5 ff.). Evidently the prophet was in the habit of at least making himself more susceptible to the divine revelation by this means. The prophetic condition was also at times accompanied by a trance: the *tardemah* or deep sleep into which Jahveh cast Abraham before a revelation (Gen. xv. 12) seems to have resembled the mesmeric sleep. Men who were under the power of the spirit behaved wildly and were capable of tearing off their clothes and exposing themselves. Such behaviour was apparently so common that the young captains of Jehu's camp, when a prophet visited him, asked their leader with a jeer what this madman had to say to him (2 Kings ix. 11). Hosea says (ix. 7) that the

man who hath the spirit is mad; and while he says this to show how men who desired to evade the prophet's rebuke excused themselves for their neglect, the choice of the phrase proves that there was enough in the behaviour of some of the prophets to justify their attitude. These and similar phenomena are enough to show that Hebrew prophecy, so far as the attendant conditions which stimulated it and which followed it were concerned, had a great deal in common with the aberrations which have always accompanied religious excitement, especially among Eastern peoples.

On the other hand, it is important to recognise that such conditions were never counted essential to a prophet's equipment, and were never appealed to as the guarantee of the truth of any individual prophecy. Even early prophets like Gad, Nathan, Micaiah ben Imlah, Elijah, make no use of such methods.[16] In connection with Elijah, indeed, they seem to be expressly set aside. The prophets of Baal cry and cut themselves with knives and dance wildly round the altar. The prophet of Jahveh mocks them, because such conduct is befitting to men who have to do with a god who may need to be awaked. But Elijah himself stands with outstretched hands beside the altar he has restored, and prays to Jahveh in ordered and articulate speech (1 Kings xviii. 28, 36). It is impossible to resist the impression that the contrast between the two attitudes is conscious and deliberate.[17]

Nor are such conditions appealed to as the guarantee of the truth of the message which the prophets announced. When prophecy became conscious of itself, Deuteronomy gave two criteria for distinguishing a true prophet. The fact that two are given is the proof of the difficulty in which the question was involved. But, while the tests differed in other respects, they agreed in this, that they laid weight, not on

the condition of the prophet, but on the content of his message (xiii. 1–5, xviii. 20–22).

It would appear that Israel had not, especially in the early stages of prophecy, advanced beyond the idea that the proof of the presence of the divine is to be found in something outside or beyond the sphere of the common life, and that men are most likely to reach a higher revelation when their common faculties are least active. Man was most likely to be a fitting vehicle for a divine influence when in trance or dream his own personality had sunk out of an active into a passive state, and when the outward world, with its confusing and seductive impressions, had ceased to control him. Man could find God when, under the influence of music, he was stirred by an excitement which carried him beyond his ordinary unimpressionable existence. But have nineteen hundred years of Christianity, with the Incarnation as their central theme, succeeded in changing that fundamental bent of the human mind, or in substituting a nobler criterion for revelation? Two conceptions of the spiritual life, which are fundamentally different, have generally co-existed in every higher religion. There is no need to deny the presence of the lower idea in Israel's prophecy: what alone is of much significance is to detect the presence of the higher and to recognise how upon it the emphasis was increasingly laid.

For this, the best method is to find the task which prophecy undertook, and the spirit in which it fulfilled its task. Now the first task which prophecy fulfilled for Israel was, as we have seen, to give to the national uprising which the king led the inspiration of religion; the second task was to criticise the kingdom which in a measure was its own creation. The spirit in which prophecy fulfilled this task is to be gathered from the principles in the light of which it sought to control the kingdom.

It was the national faith, speaking through prophecy, which gave the kingdom power to assert itself. Yet the kingdom also represented a secular necessity. Since the kingdom represented the new consciousness of its own power on the part of the nation, it was sure to develop along its own lines. And further, since the kingdom brought the nation more closely into contact with all the other nations by which it was surrounded, and had the inevitable result of exposing the people to new foreign influences, these influences, which were alien to the spirit of Israel's distinctive past and its religion, were sure to gain new force through the very institution which had owed its origin to the need for asserting Israel's independent existence. So soon as the institution developed along lines which were, or seemed, inconsistent with the aims of the religion, it roused the suspicion and the opposition of the prophets, in whom this religion had its mouthpiece. In all this side of their action the motive of the prophets was, not the accidental good or ill success of the kingdom, but the view they held of the religion to serve which they conceived that the king had been anointed in Israel.

It is necessary to develop this view at some length. It has become almost an axiom since Wellhausen [18] promulgated it that the prophets were the stormy petrels of the Hebrew State; that they appeared in their support of or conflict with the king whenever the State was threatened with external calamity; and that their function was to interpret the purpose of Jahveh in connection with the calamities which were already threatening the kingdom.

The theory, however, does not correspond with the facts of the history. On the one hand, there were troubles which threatened the very existence of Judah, on which Jeremiah looked with perfect calmness; [19] on the other hand (and

this is of special interest to us, since the facts dealt with fall within the period of the early monarchy), there are many cases in which a prophet intervenes although the kingdom is at peace. The earliest appearance of a prophet in the reign of David was at a time when the king had so far reduced his realm to peace that he could remain in his capital and leave the war, which was no longer a war of self-defence but one of conquest, to be conducted by his general. When Solomon had brought his kingdom to a peculiar pitch of outward security and inward organisation, a prophet appeared, not to declare the imminent trouble from without nor to explain any impending catastrophe, but to appeal to elements within the nation and support Jeroboam against the king.[20] The house of Omri, the first royal house which succeeded in making Northern Israel a recognised power beyond the limits of its own territory by waging successful war against Damascus, roused the vehement opposition of the prophets: and Ahab, the ablest, so far as political capacity is concerned, of that able house, was condemned by Elijah and Micaiah ben Imlah. Elijah rose to confront Ahab when the king's power was so firmly assured that he could ally himself with the royal house of Phœnicia; Micaiah ben Imlah prophesied his ruin when Ahab was strong enough to assert his authority over the transjordanic territory, and was planning a campaign in order to assert this authority. The case of Micaiah ben Imlah is peculiarly instructive in this connection. When Ahab reluctantly consented to consult the prophet as to the campaign against Ramoth Gilead, the king's reluctance was due to his recognition of Micaiah as one who was in permanent opposition to the royal policy (1 Kings xxii. 8). Evidently the prophet's judgment on Ahab rested on some conviction which had formulated itself before the troubles on the frontier, and

therefore expressed an opposition to the king's policy that was based on something more fundamental and permanent than the accident of the troubles with Syria. In all these cases the prophet was prompted in his intervention by reasons which were quite apart from the threat of impending calamity. The impending calamity holds at best a secondary place.

There are, however, a number of cases in which the prophet appeared at a time when calamities were threatening the State. The mistake of those who have regarded the prophets as only intervening in the time of external calamity is that they have construed the double effect of a common cause as cause and effect. The common cause which roused the prophet into activity, and which was liable to bring the kingdom into novel peril, was the increased strength of king and kingdom. The proof that this is the common cause is to be found in the fact that, even when this new strength did not bring the kingdom into outward peril, it frequently disclosed elements within the nation which of themselves roused the opposition of the prophets.

It is easy to see how the kingdom, because of the new self-consciousness and centralised power which it gave to the nation, was sure to bring Israel into collision with its neighbours. So long as the people remained a mere collection of separate and mutually suspicious tribes, they were a negligible factor in the confused politics of Western Asia; but so soon as, having found a common head, they dared to seek a united and independent line of action, they drew on themselves the jealousy of their neighbours. An early illustration of this is to be found in the life-history of David. While David was no more than the head of a little principality which was confined to Judah, and while he was at war with Ishbaal, the leader of the Northern tribes at Mahanaim, the Philistines left the petty kinglets to neutralise

each other by their mutual animosity. But, so soon as David had been recognised as the king of all Israel, and had made Jerusalem the capital of his kingdom, the Philistines attacked him. The new strength of the kingdom led directly to its dangers.

It may not, however, be so obvious at first sight why the increased strength of the kingdom, in itself and apart from all external dangers, should have called forth the jealousy of the prophets. Yet the kingdom, whenever it succeeded in asserting its independent existence, was compelled to enter into relations, even to form alliances, with the States by which it was surrounded.

Now every such alliance in the ancient world brought with it religious sanctions, since to enter into alliance with a foreign power implied a certain recognition of its god. Even a less formal relation than an alliance threatened religious intermixture. Its success and growing strength forced the nation into relations to and compromises with a world which was heathen, and, if not into the adoption, at least into the tolerance of alien rites. Such a situation instantly roused into activity the strongly Jahvistic prophets, whether the king's alliance was a sign of his vigour or of his defeat.

Within the nation itself, moreover, the change was equally great and influential. The king and kingdom in Israel introduced a wholly new state of affairs. The centralised government changed the whole centre of gravity in the administration of justice. Old Israel had been governed by the tribal elders, who sat in the gate and administered a law which was bound upon all the members by the sanction of its common recognition. The strength of this older morality with its simple forms of administration lay in the fact that, although it was primitive and undeveloped, it represented a

law which all men acknowledged and which drew its sanctions from being thus acknowledged by the whole community. Its weakness lay in this, that, based as it was on the commune and the tribe, it fostered that disintegration of Israel which left the people at the mercy of a strongly organised power like the Philistines. The king met the weakness of this political condition, since he gathered the tribes into a unity and beat back the invaders. He inevitably gathered round him a body of men who were under his sole authority, a standing army which may have been small, but was of superior training (1 Sam. xiv. 52), and officials who owned him as their master. With the new security of the country and the entry of Israel into the comity of the nations came also trade: and this introduced a new element into the community. Alongside the burgher, possessed of his own land and amenable to the commune, from the life of which he could not separate himself, arose a body of landless men who held the real power. Some of these were foreigners, like Uriah the Hittite, and the Carites and Pelethites who formed David's bodyguard (2 Sam. xx. 23), or like the chamberlain who earned Isaiah's bitter contempt (Isa. xxii. 15–19). Into the hands of these men the real power was passing, and yet they were not bound by the sanctions of the old morality, but looked to the king as the source of their authority and the giver of the only law which they acknowledged. To whom was the king, as the head of this new social organisation, responsible, after he had delivered the nation? "The crucial problem of political constitutions is to counteract the selfishness of a governing class."[21] The difficulty lay before Israel of finding new forms for a truly national justice, which, through representatives whom all acknowledged, could check the selfishness of such a class of men as now governed Israel.[22]

The change had come with the coming of the kingdom: and, whenever the king was strong enough to make his centralised power break in upon the older tribal arrangements, the change was felt most sharply. This is the reason why the king early roused the watchful jealousy of the prophets, apart from and even in the absence of any outward crisis in the condition of the nation. Prophecy realised that an institution which was not merely the expression of Israel's national strength, but the creation of its national faith, had not been called into existence in order to make it possible that a few men, who had been given new power thereby, should use their authority to ignore justice.[23] Hence from the beginning the prophets appear as the curb on a lawless power and on the side of the oppressed and the weak. And each prophet appears as such in the name of Jahveh. He does not speak in the name of a law which has already been recognised, for the difficulty of the situation was that there was no such law which received an equal recognition by all. He speaks in the name of the outraged Jahveh, who is the ultimate guardian of all justice and right. Nor does he come as the representative of any class who have received a special training or who are possessed of an esoteric knowledge: he comes from among the people, and speaks, as one to whom Jahveh has revealed Himself, to men about whom he can take it for granted that they acknowledge the authority with which he comes. His very coming, therefore, makes it clear that the God in whose name he comes was regarded by all men in Israel as having for His peculiar care the justice and righteousness which are present or absent in Israel.

Thus Nathan appears in David's palace to condemn the king for the invasion of the rights of one of his subjects. The king has used his power to trample on the rights of one

who is weak, and who, as a foreigner, was peculiarly subject to the royal will.[24] Elijah appears before Ahab to condemn the king for having invaded the right of Naboth. Ahab, who was himself an Israelite and who recognised the power of old custom and privilege in Israel, gave up all thought of further action in the matter when he learned that Naboth had refused the vineyard. It was at the instigation of Jezebel, who came to Israel with the petty conceptions of the power of the king which prevailed in heathenism, that he ventured to permit the act which brought the instant anger of the prophet.

In both these cases we discover the prophet taking action when the king was in the very plenitude of his power, not when the kingdom was exposed to external danger. He acted on motives which were supplied by prophecy itself and did not come to it from without. In the view of the prophet, the kingdom had been called into existence to serve the ends of Jahveh in and with Israel. So soon as, therefore, the king, in his self-confident strength, began to act from the point of view of one who served his own selfish ends, the prophet intervened. The movement did not find its motive from without, but from its consciousness of itself and its mission to express the mind of Jahveh, the national God, who sustains justice and righteousness among His people.[25] Jahveh, as the God who has given Israel its land and the kingdom as the means to defend its land, is the only God whom Israel may in any way acknowledge. Israel's pride and strength is to obey the will of its Maker, a will which is righteous and just, in the sense in which men recognise justice and righteousness in their relations to one another. Hence the State which serves Him must have a moral basis, and the prophet who is His mouthpiece must protest against anything which saps that moral basis. From the beginning these were

the ruling principles for which, without clear consciousness of all that they implied, prophetism had stood: but the full purport of these principles came to clearer expression in the time of the king who offended against them both. With Elijah, the most majestic figure in the Bible, and his contest against Ahab we enter on a new, because a more conscious, stage of religion.[26]

Ahab entered into alliance with Tyre, and, to make the alliance the stronger, he not only married into the royal house, but built a temple to the Tyrian Baal in his capital. He himself had no wish to forsake the national God, for his two sons Ahaziah and Joram, even his daughter Athaliah,[27] bore names compounded with Jahveh. He maintained about his court four hundred prophets of Jahveh and consulted them: his objection to Micaiah ben Imlah was not that he was a prophet of Jahveh, but that he was a prophet who never foretold anything except evil. Ahab seems to have thought it possible to patch up a compromise by which the worship of Jahveh and of Baal could be practised together in Israel.[28] But Ahab also, in his strength and merited popularity, ventured to outrage the national sense of justice. Encouraged by his wife, he began to assimilate the kingdom to the baser conceptions of heathenism. It is impossible that the incident with Naboth was the only case in which this came to expression: the incident is quoted because it was the particular one which forced Elijah to take action.

Against one side of the royal conduct, Ahab's tolerance of an alien worship, certain elements in Israel lifted up their head. The Rechabites protested against the worship of Baal in the name of Jahveh's sole sovereignty in Israel: and Jehu, as was natural in a man of his type, sought and found in them his support. But as a prophet, Elijah protested against both tendencies on the part of the king: and his action

proves the wider character of prophetism. Apparently his first overt act was against the king's outrage to justice; but he protested against the two parts of the royal policy, because he saw that the two belonged together. To him Jahvism and Baalism represented hopelessly incompatible principles. He did not protest against Baal as a foreign god whose worship endangered Israel's nationality, for he was no vehement assertor of Israel's nationality. He was not zealous for an intellectual monotheism, though his attitude at Carmel shows he had reached a position which cannot be distinguished from monotheism. His scoffing reference to Baal proves this, for a god at whom men scoff is as good as non-existent. But he protested with all the vehemence of a passionate nature against the worship of a god whose character was fundamentally opposed to all that claimed his reverence in the God of his own worship.

Jahveh and Baal, between whom the people stood hesitating, were incompatible because they represented principles which imply conduct. The fundamental convictions for which the two divine names stood were of such a nature that they determined also everything for which the kingdom and the nation of Israel stood. Both of them could not be justified: and the nation was at the parting of the ways, where it must determine how its future was to be shaped by the character of the god it elected to worship. For Elijah himself, Jahveh was ethical in the sense that He demands, in those whom He wills to protect, justice and righteousness. To reject this demand was practically to ignore the will which had brought nation and kingdom into existence for its own purposes.

Elijah failed, for Jezebel was able to expel him: and it was Jezebel who did expel him. She, who was devoted to

Baal, was as clear-sighted as Elijah to recognise that any compromise was impossible.

The prophet withdrew to Horeb, the place from which the nation, strong in its single-hearted devotion to Jahveh and confident in the sense of His powerful protection, set out to take possession of the land in which it was to fulfil the purpose of the God who called it into being. And here he received a new revelation of Jahveh's purpose with His nation. The revelation is contained in three great theophanies —wind, earthquake, and fire [29]—which declare what Jahveh is about to do. When the prophet, who is privileged to know what Jahveh is about to do, goes out to hear what these things mean, he learns in the sound of the thin silence that Jahveh is about to bring the whole existing order in Israel to an end. In three crushing calamities,[30] which correspond to the fire, earthquake, and storm, the kingdom of Ahab is about to fall, and to fall through the self-manifestation of Jahveh. Since the kingdom has ignored Jahveh and His purposes with it and through it, and since it is no longer a fit instrument for His will, Jahveh reveals His purpose to shatter it where once He revealed His purpose for it.[31]

As to whether this means the passing away of Israel nothing is said here. But the prophet had already received the revelation in the desert that there remained seven thousand in Israel, all the knees that had not bowed to Baal and all the lips that had not kissed him. These cannot share the fate of the sinful kingdom, since that which brings its fate on the kingdom is the self-revelation of the Jahveh whom they have worshipped; and it is a legitimate inference that the prophet receives his revelation not merely for his personal consolation, but for the guidance of his future work among these very men.

But what is evident here is that to Elijah Jahveh is a

power independent of the kingdom and of the nation. He brought it into being, and can continue, though it should cease. The Kingdom of God is something which stands above the empirical kingdom of Israel: its aims are not exhausted in Israel's aims, its issues are not confined to the issues of Israel's national life. Not merely can prophecy rise up to rebuke an apostate king in the name of Jahveh: it can contemplate without utter dismay the collapse of the kingdom itself in the interests of this larger aim. "If Jahveh triumphs over Baal, Elijah has reached his purpose, though Israel in the process may need to vanish into an insignificant remnant." [32] The will of Jahveh which is revealed through the prophet once created this kingdom, but it did this to serve a wider end. When Israel fails to fulfil, or even to seek, this end, the will of Jahveh, revealed anew to the prophet, sweeps the kingdom out of its way.

And all this was revealed to Elijah at a period when Ahab seemed secure through his alliance with a foreign power like Phœnicia—so secure that he ventured to interfere with the old customs of his kingdom. The movement of prophetism, which here reached its clearer self-consciousness, was motived from within and drew its strength from its own conceptions of the aims befitting a nation which owed its being to Jahveh, and the ideals befitting the king who within this nation was called the anointed of Jahveh.

CHAPTER IV.

AMOS.

Of the personal life and history of this great prophet and great man almost nothing is known. It is not even certain whether he was a native of the Northern or of the Southern kingdom;[1] for, while he began his work at a festival in Bethel, his appearance there may have been due to the recognition on the part of a native of Judah that the centre of gravity for the national life lay in Samaria, or merely to the desire of a native of Northern Israel to speak to his fellow-countrymen. What, however, we do know is that he was a man of the people (vii. 14), who had no connection with the official religious class. And this, in view of the religious ideas with which he is at home and with which he evidently expected his hearers to be familiar, gives us a singular impression of the high level of religious thought and of its richness of content in the minds of common men in the country.

The period of the prophet's activity was the reign of Jeroboam II. in Israel. There is no sign in his prophecy of the internal anarchy which followed the death of this strong ruler, or of the resultant sense of weakness on the part of the kings who followed Jeroboam, which sent Israel to seek alliance, now with Assyria, now with Egypt (Hos. vii. 11). The people, especially the governing class, were confident of their own strength (vi. 1, 13). Yet there are indications

which point to the period having been one of grave, though unexpressed, unrest. The Syrian wars had resulted in parts of the national territory beyond Jordan having been torn away (i. 3, 13). Though the loss had only been for a time, it left an uneasy thought that the holy land had been in the possession of strangers. But, while the wars between Israel and Damascus were the source of recurrent anxiety, the troubles which attended Northern Israel were due to its internal condition rather than its external relations. Northern Israel was peculiarly exposed to the conditions which, by breaking up the simpler tribal organisation, were introducing new difficulties and setting new problems before all who were responsible for its government. The Northern tribes broke off from the Davidic kingdom when Solomon attempted to centralise the government at Jerusalem; but, by the very irony of circumstances, they relieved Judah from perplexities which they themselves could not evade. For the kingdom of Jerusalem now became practically the tribe of Judah; and the king, representing the head of the clans, carried over to his office all the old sanctions and maintained the old relations. At the same time, the little isolated kingdom, which had not much occasion for direct dealings with foreigners, was delivered from the difficulties which attended the adjustment of its relations to heathen neighbours. On the other hand, the Northern tribes had no sooner rebelled against the centralising tendencies of Solomon than they found themselves face to face with the necessity of creating a strong central authority within their own territory. Damascus was at their door and had risen to new power and new ambitions. The same cause which had made Saul's kingdom a necessity for Israel made the Northern kingdom an inevitable thing; and the Northern tribes had to face the necessity of calling into existence a centralised

authority among a people whose sense of tribal independence had been strengthened through having successfully asserted itself in the rebellion under Jeroboam I. It was also necessary for them to enter into some relations to their heathen neighbours. Not only did their territory touch Damascus and Phœnicia, but one of the great trade-routes of the world ran through the centre of their country along the plain of Esdraelon. If they had tried to close it, and so remain aloof, force would have burst it open. When they sought to use it for their own purposes, the men who were enriched by trade formed a new and difficult element in their social organisation, since these men were cut off from all old ties and earlier allegiance. In Northern Israel there were present all the elements of the new time which were making the problem before Israel so difficult and so urgent.

It added to this perplexity that the perpetual menace of Syria had never left the kingdom at peace. The central authority was weak in itself, since it owed its existence to a revolt against all centralised power; and it had been too hard pressed by the exigencies of national defence to find time, even if it had had the desire, to attend to the task of strengthening the administration of justice and of discovering the fit means of enforcing justice among the citizens. The powerful men in the kingdom were using the wealth and influence which they had won through real services to the State, to serve their own selfish ends; and they were able to ignore or bribe into silence the weakened organs of justice. There was no counterweight to their power in the central government, for the weak rulers could not do without their support. It is a common condition of every period of great social change; and it is still possible to recognise its character in the strong invectives which Amos levels against the powerful men in the State.

How deep the sense of discontent was, which this condition of affairs brought with it, is to be seen in the cry for justice which rings through the utterances of the early prophets. In men who, like Amos, belonged to the commons, the people found their voice and representatives, as in the religion which these men represented they found the sanction for their complaints.

The feeling that matters were not right in the body politic was strongest in the men who, because they were religious men, looked for a moral basis to society. Amos speaks of a class of men who were at ease in Samaria, because they could make their own profit from such troubled times, and describes them as those who laugh the idea of the day of the Lord down the wind, yet by their very conduct bring the year of violence nearer (vi. 3).[2] But he spoke also of the devout in Israel as those who desired the day of the Lord (v. 18). Such men felt that matters were going badly with Israel, and they looked for a cure in some act of intervention by which Jahveh was to prove alike His presence and His power. They were ready to listen to and to support a prophet who declared that the day of the Lord was at hand. That the court was conscious of this ferment and very uneasy as to its possible issue is proved by Amaziah's conduct when Amos appeared at Bethel. He tried to frighten the prophet into silence, but he also hurried off a messenger to bid Jeroboam be on his guard. The discontent had found its voice, and the king and his vizier were conscious of the risk. How real the danger was, the house of Jehu was little likely to ignore, for they owed their throne to a similar movement among the people.

The time was one which called for a prophet. "The place of the prophet is in a religious crisis where the ordinary interpretation of acknowledged principles breaks down, where

it is necessary to go back, not to received doctrine, but to Jahveh Himself. The word of Jahveh through the prophet is properly a declaration of what Jahveh, as the personal King of Israel, commands in this particular crisis; and it is spoken with authority, not as an inference from previous revelation, but as the direct expression of the character and will of a personal God, who has made Himself personally audible in the prophet's soul."[3] The time called for such a man, and in God's providence it brought one of the great men of history.

I.

The message which Amos brought to the men of his time was that of the near approach of the day of the Lord. Jahveh was about to intervene in the affairs of His world, and He had made known to His prophet that which He was about to do.

Primarily this intervention concerned Israel, all Israel. Amos spoke about, and he spoke to, the whole family which Jahveh brought up out of the land of Egypt (ii. 10, iii. 1; cf. ix. 7). When he described the catastrophe which was to result from God's intervention, he gave as its scope the land from the entering in of Hamath unto the brook of Egypt (vi. 14);[4] and that land was the whole of Palestine. Amos, as was natural in a public speaker, was not always careful in his use of the name Israel and did not merely employ the term of the Northern kingdom. Yet it deserves notice that, when he spoke to Amaziah at Bethel of how Jahveh had measured Israel's sin with a plumbline (vii. 7), this followed the statement that Jahveh had twice before threatened Jacob (vii. 1–6). That the prophet made a distinction between Jacob and Israel points to his being conscious of how his work at Bethel was part of a larger commission; and that

Amaziah, when he told the disturber of the peace that this sort of thing could not be tolerated in Israel, bade him flee away and prophesy in Judah, shows how those who heard him speak recognised that Amos' message concerned the Southern as well as the Northern kingdom. Had the threat contained in the prophecy been one which was confined to Israel proper, Amaziah could only have ordered silence to this disturber of the peace. But what he says to Amos practically amounts to the statement that this sort of thing will not be tolerated where Jeroboam is king, and that the prophet may go away across the border and exercise his function there.

The oracle of ii. 4 f., in which an express judgment is launched against Judah, is generally recognised, on other grounds, as a later addition. But the commentator who added these sentences only brought out more clearly how, either in his own judgment or in the judgment of the men of his own time, Amos' prophecy was not regarded as being directed exclusively against North Israel. Either he failed to recognise that (in ii. 10, iii. 1, vi. 1) Amos showed how his judgment was directed against the entire people who owned a common origin and revealed a common sin, or he desired to make explicit a feature of the prophecy which seemed to deserve a stronger emphasis from the beginning. But, whatever may have been the motive which led to the insertion of the two verses, the fact that they were inserted proves that Amos was still regarded as having a message for all Israel.

Further, the intervention of Jahveh concerned more than united Israel, for it included the nations which were Israel's neighbours. When the prophet swept round the horizon and described how the wrath of Jahveh began at Damascus (i. 3–5), passed on to Philistia (6–8) and Tyre (9 f.), included Edom (11 f.), Ammon (13–15) and Moab (ii. 1–3), and then centred upon His own people, he no doubt brought home

very vividly to Israel the responsibility of its privilege as Jahveh's people. But he also showed how in his own view and in that of his contemporaries the power of Jahveh was such that He held in His hands the control over the fate of these nations, and he showed that he expected as the outcome of the divine self-manifestation an intervention in the concerns of these nations as well as of Israel. The offence of the peoples which are threatened is not one which they have committed against Israel: it has been against Jahveh and His order in the world which He controls. Jahveh is directly concerned with them, and not merely concerned with them so far as they influence Israel. The fate which is to befall them has the same motive and source as the fate which is to befall Israel, and is therefore as sure as the fate which is to befall Israel.[5]

The reason why Amos selected these nations was that they represented the world as Israel knew it, the world in which Israel had grown accustomed to live. He chose the peoples N.E., S.W., N.W., S.E., of Palestine as the representatives of this order, and he anticipated an intervention by Jahveh which was to subvert all this apparently so secure and settled order of things. An instructive parallel, which makes clearer what guided Amos in his selection of the nations against which he uttered doom, is to be found in the prophecy spoken by a great moralist of a later date. Zephaniah also prophesied the near approach of the day of the Lord, and in ch. ii. announced the scope of the judgment which the day was to bring about. It was to fall upon the land of the Philistines (vers. 4–7), Moab and Ammon (8–11), the Ethiopians (12), and Assyria (13–15). The horizon here has widened to correspond with the altered circumstances of the time. New peoples have come within the view of Judah, and old peoples have disappeared.

Zephaniah wrote at a time when not merely Samaria but Damascus had been swept away by the Assyrian conquests, and so the Northern horizon was occupied for him by Assyria instead of Damascus. Ethiopia was known as the land which had sent messengers to the court at Jerusalem (Isa. xviii.), and so the limits of the South were extended to a land with which Judah had been brought into connection. But, while the outlook has widened, the conception remained the same. Jahveh was about to intervene in the world, and His intervention would change the settled order to which men have grown so accustomed that they think it unalterable. Each of these prophets set this thought in the conditions of his own time, and described it in terms which made it vivid to the minds of his auditors. North and south, east and west, the face of the settled world was to be changed, because Jahveh was about to manifest Himself. Each of these prophets, because he was commissioned to his own people and because his primary interest in what he announced was in its cause—the anger of Jahveh over sin—insisted on the meaning of the day of the Lord to the people to whom he was sent, and on the purpose Jahveh had in the thing which He was about to do. But both of them declared that the judgment was one which was to include not merely their own people, but the world of their own time. They used concrete terms instead of abstract, but they anticipated a world-judgment, which was to overturn the entire arrangement of mortal affairs which seemed to men so stable.

Again, this judgment is described in terms which merit a closer observation. When Amos spoke directly to Israel, he used terms which were fitted to bring the purpose of Jahveh close to the conscience and life of the people; and there is a restraint in his language which is the natural outcome of his strong moral aims. But, especially in his

general references to Jahveh's work and in his representations of its effect on the nations, he used language which shows the presence of another conception which he was turning to this peculiar end. Thus he speaks of Jahveh's intervention by a fire which is sent on Hazael (i. 4), on Gaza (i. 7), on Teman (i. 12), on Rabbah (i. 14), on Moab (ii. 2); and when he describes the threatened judgment which passed away from Israel on his entreaty (ch. vii.), he speaks of how the Lord God called to contend by fire which devoured the *t'hom* or 'great deep,' and would have eaten up the land (ver. 4).[6] The fire of Jahveh, meant here, cannot be a fire of conquest, for there is no fire of conquest which devours the great deep; and to say that the great deep need mean no more than the Mediterranean Sea does not increase its inflammability. The fire of Jahveh can only be the fire of the world-catastrophe.

There are other indications of the same view. When Jahveh shall vindicate His purpose in the world, He is described as doing it through an earthquake (viii. 8, ii. 13–16),[7] or by an eclipse which He shall bring over the face of the sun (viii. 9). And when the judgment does arrive, Amos, though he is insisting on its effect within the land of Palestine, describes its range as absolute. Those who seek to escape from it shall find themselves powerless: though they climb to Heaven, Jahveh shall bring them down; though they dig deep to Sheol, His hand shall take them (ix. 2); though they hide in the sea-bottom, He commands the serpent there, and it shall bite them (ix. 3).

All this implies a view of Jahveh's power as absolute, since He can use everything for His own purposes. He is able, when He asserts His sovereignty over the world, to make all things serve His will, since there is nothing which is beyond His power.[8] But the statements imply also that,

since Jahveh in His day is about to use such instruments, and since men in His day are conceived as seeking for such refuges, the day of the divine self-manifestation is one in which He is about to manifest His sovereignty over the world. Unless Jahveh's purpose is to make clear His government of the world, it is difficult to understand why He is represented as employing these means in His day.

It is true that these larger statements with the conception of Jahveh which corresponds to them do not occur in connection with the matters which Amos is most eager to press upon the consciences of his fellow-countrymen. When he speaks of Jahveh as having to do with the heathen powers, he clothes his statement of Jahveh's action in vague and tremendous threats (i. 2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, ii. 2). When he speaks of the visions which he received before he came forward as a prophet to Israel to declare to his people their sin, he makes use of them (vii. 1, 4). And when he, as it were, lets himself go in a philippic on the fate of Israel without describing the sin which has brought this fate (ix. 1–8*a*), his language is peculiarly full of them. But whenever he is dealing directly with the conditions of the people, their duty and their sin, these forms of expression disappear. That is as much as to say that these conceptions form the background of Amos' thought and show what he holds in common with his contemporaries. When he came as a prophet to Israel, he did not come with a new message as to Jahveh's power, but as to Jahveh's character and as to the purposes for which He brought His power into evidence. The prophet and the people were in agreement in their view of the power which Jahveh possessed, so that it was no unfamiliar thought to them that the day of the Lord should imply a world-catastrophe. The sayings which imply a relation of God to the world are in the background, because they

represent what the prophet held in common with his contemporaries; but the moment he brings forward his specific message of how the day of the Lord implies a judgment on Israel, they cease to be prominent.

But, further, these general utterances which imply a relation of Jahveh to the world are coloured by, are even saturated in, old mythological ideas. The fire of Jahveh which devours the *t'hom*, the serpent in the sea-bottom, the roar of Jahveh from Mount Zion, are phrases which can only be rightly interpreted when it is recognised how behind them lie ideas as to the cosmos and Jahveh's relation to the cosmos which are much older than Amos and which are not even peculiar to Israel. They have their analogies in other faiths, and, from the fact that they are so readily employed by Amos, prove that the thought of Israel was influenced by ideas which the people held in common with the other nations. The source of these ideas may be traced with more or less certainty; but, whatever may be their source and their associations, the phrases which embody them in Amos have a certain colourlessness which implies that they have lost the definiteness of application which once attached to them. Thus Amos speaks (i. 2) of how Jahveh shall roar from Zion and utter His voice from Jerusalem, and of how as a result the pastures of the shepherds shall mourn and the top of Carmel shall wither. Most commentaries on the passage are content to state that the divine theophany is here described under the figure of a thunderstorm, and to suggest how this may imply that Jahveh was originally a god of the nature-forces, and in particular was brought into close association with thunder and lightning. Yet I understand that thunderstorms do not, as a matter of fact, arise in Palestine over Mount Zion; and it is certain that, even if they did, their effect could never have been to make Carmel-

top wither or to ruin the pastures. Evidently the figure of the withering Carmel and the languishing pastures has been taken from another description of a theophany which represented Jahveh's coming under the image of a blasting desert-wind. Such a wind was a familiar and dreaded visitant on the cultivated land. The two representations are natural in themselves, especially in Palestine; and both are used separately in other parts of Scripture of the divine action.

But men do not mix such figures together till the phrases which describe them have become so colourless with frequent use that they have ceased to convey a definite impression. Amos, in fact, is using stock phrases.

If it be said that this verse is late,[9] the same impression is conveyed by i. 14, where it is said that Jahveh shall kindle a fire in Rabbah, which is to devour its palaces with shouting in the day of battle, with a tempest in the day of the whirlwind. Here the fire of Jahveh which devours the *t^{e}hom* (vii. 4), the tempest and war are confused together hopelessly. Again, one has to say that men—and especially a man of Amos' individuality of mind—do not heap together phrases like this, so long as the figures which the words represent convey a definite impression. The more confused the picture is, the more clear does it become that this method of representing Jahveh's work has grown colourless because it is merely traditional. The serpent in the sea-bottom may once have been a rival power to the God of order; but Amos is able to speak of it and use it in his prophecy, because already the Hebrew faith has outgrown the risk of his reference to the sea-serpent being misunderstood. In the same way the faith has so moved away from the conception of the God who can only reveal Himself through nature-forces, that a prophet can employ this traditional phraseology without danger.

As to the origin of this conception of the world-catastrophe and the source from which the language in which it is embodied has been taken, two suggestions have recently been made. Meyer[10] holds that it was derived from Egypt, and quotes some interesting and suggestive descriptions of the appearance of prophets to announce the end of the world-order at the court of Egypt. Gressmann[11] believes that the original from which Israel borrowed is to be looked for among the Canaanites, whatever its ultimate source may be. This is not the place to inquire as to whence the conception was derived, or even as to whether it is necessary to suppose that it was borrowed at all.[12] But it is interesting and valuable to recognise that, before it could be borrowed, if it was borrowed, it must have had its point of connection with Hebrew thought. I say with Hebrew thought, rather than with the thought of one man like Amos, for it is evident that it was not in his view of the scope of the judgment, nor in his view that it came from Jahveh, that Amos differed from his contemporaries. The very vagueness of his language points to the fact that he was using terms which were familiar to the men of his time, and that he, a man of the people, had received the conception from the same sources as those by which it reached them. Before the thought could take possession of men's minds, and especially before it could be transformed by a prophet, it must have had its appeal to the stage of thought which the people had reached.

Now this eschatology, even in its crudest form, stood for the truth that the world was one and was governed by one purpose. It stood for the possibility of the emergence of the eternal order within the world of time. Behind this world, which seems to men so enduring, lies an eternal order which may break in upon this, whenever God wills. What men expect to break in depends on what they believe of the

God at whose order it comes. I do not stop to ask how far such a conception in one form or another is essential to every real religion; but I wish to insist how apt the minds of men in Israel were either to formulate such a scheme of thought at the present stage of their history or to borrow it from outside and mould it to serve the uses of the faith which they held. They had learned to believe that there was only one Will which sustains and governs all things. They had learned to conceive of God as spiritual in the sense that He was not contained in, but above, the world and all it held. They thought of God as will, and the very nature of will is that it should realise itself. This eschatological conception of the emergence of the spiritual order was the natural form in which such a faith should embody itself.

Gressmann seeks to prove [13] that in its earliest form the conception of the world-catastrophe was unethical and belonged to those cosmological theories as to the relation of God and the universe with which the heathen religions were so greatly concerned. This may be the case, so far as its appearance in these other faiths is concerned. But there is no evidence that it circulated in such a form even among the minds of the men in Israel who were least affected by the prophets' thoughts. So far as our evidence as to the thought of Israel during Amos' period carries us—and beyond that we have no right to pronounce—the conception of the world-catastrophe seems to have united in the minds of religious Israelites with their conviction of how Jahveh held a peculiar relation to Israel. They believed that Jahveh had the power to intervene and realise His purpose at any hour; they also believed that, since they were His people, His intervention must be for the benefit of those who were His own. All, therefore, who saw how bad the state of affairs was within the nation,

were longing that Jahveh should make no delay, but speedily usher in His day; and they were ready to listen to a prophet whose commission it was to declare that this day was at hand.

Where Amos differed from the religious men of his nation was not as to the scope which the divine intervention must take, but as to its character and its issue. Because of his knowledge of the nature of Jahveh, the emergence of the eternal order within the sphere of time meant to him the revelation of the moral order of the universe. To those who listened to him he declared not only that Jahveh was about to arise speedily, but why He was to intervene. He was about to assert the moral basis which is the basis of everything, and when that manifested itself, it meant ruin to the world of things which Amos knew.

This is the new thought which is present in the prophet's announcement. He comes forward to announce a catastrophe which shall involve all the nations that make up the world with which Israel has to do. The idea of this, as within the power of the God whom they worship, cannot have been foreign to the thought of those who listened while he spoke. They may have listened, with awe indeed but with a certain satisfaction, to the roll of judgment as it swept round their horizon. And the contentment with which they listened to the prospect of other men's ruin, may have hidden from their eyes the reason given for the prophet's pronouncement. All this made Amos' crashing close the more tremendous when he declared that the unique reason which made the divine intervention necessary, made it certain that it could not spare the people on which Jahveh had lavished His ineffectual care.

One result of this change in the prophet's conception of the day of the Lord as being governed by moral ends is that

instinctively he begins to revolt against the representation of it as coming through mere natural forces. I have already pointed out how Amos uses phraseology which was evidently the common method of describing the divine theophanies through earthquake and fire, through whirlwind and thunder. But it is all colourless and confused. When he is dealing with the appearance of Jahveh on the wider scale, he still makes use of it. But when he comes forward to speak to his own nation of a God who is judging their acts, and when he has to address himself to men's conscience, all this does not appear at all. One cannot say that the prophet discards it: one can only say that he finds himself unable to use it. The idea of Jahveh, as governing the world and controlling Israel for spiritual and moral ends, is making it impossible for a prophet to use readily the older language which described the divine theophany.[14] Amos has borrowed his stereotyped language from older conceptions; but he has really outgrown what lent it its force, and he is turning to the idea that the means of Jahveh's intervention must be moral agents, even as the ends for which Jahveh intervenes are moral ends.

But the means which Jahveh may employ to make His purpose known, occupy a quite subordinate position to the prophet. What it concerns him that his people should learn is the nature of the divine purpose. The day of the Lord is the day in which Jahveh makes Himself known in the world. Because, says Amos, Jahveh is what He is, and because Israel is what it is, the result of this self-manifestation can only be one. The searching and dreadful enemy of Israel is its God. The prophet is not concerned as to the instrument by which their ruin is to be brought about; he is only concerned as to the source from which this ruin is to come, and as to the reasons which make it sure.

Because these are the matters which he is diligent to

press upon the attention of his people, Amos is wholly vague in his description of the instrument for Israel's ruin, and of the nature of that ruin.

Thus Amos never mentions Assyria, though, if Assyria had been in his mind, there was no reason why he should not have spoken about it openly. There is, however, a good reason why Assyria should not have been in his mind, and this is that Israel, at the time when the prophet wrote, had nothing to fear from the Assyrians. During the whole of Jeroboam's reign Assyria had no power and little influence in Western Asia, because the nation was fighting for its own life against the Medians and against Chaldia or Urartu, a people which occupied the country around Lake Van. Adadnirari IV. and his son Shalmanasar IV. were compelled to lead campaign after campaign against these enemies, and so far were they from being always successful that on one occasion at least the prince of Chaldia penetrated within a few days' march of Nineveh and threatened the heart of the Empire.[15] It was not until after many years of fighting that the Assyrians were able to capture Arpad, 740, and make it the basis for future operations in Western Asia. Here, in 738, Tiglat Pileser IV. or Pul received the tribute of Menahem; but during the reign of Jeroboam II. there was no danger from the Assyrian Empire.

What governs the prophet's thought is not the means by which the judgment shall be effected, but the source from which the judgment is to come.[16] The enemy whom Israel has to fear is its offended God. Amos is no politician, who watches anxiously the growing power of the Assyrian Empire, or who has observed the disunion and weakness of the petty powers of Western Asia: far less is he a clever agent busy with propaganda work in the interests of Nineveh.[17] He has come,[18] because Jahveh has made known to him that He is

about to manifest Himself in the sphere of this world. The God in whose name Amos comes, can use what instruments He pleases in order to fulfil His ends, for Heaven and Sheol are within His power, and it is His to wield all the forces of nature. He is not only the one real force behind all else in the world, but He is a free personality, who is not bound to any nation. It is true that He has entered into a special relation to the people of Israel, but that relation rests on a free choice by its God (iii. 1 f.), so that Israel is an instrument for a purpose which is greater than it has conceived. Jahveh is about to intervene in such wise that all the world shall know it, but His intervention must be specially clear in the very nation in which He once made known His purpose. What that purpose is, and why, when Jahveh asserts Himself anew in the world, His self-manifestation must lead to this that He can no longer support the nation He once chose to set His name there—that is the burden of the prophet's message. But what instruments Jahveh may choose to chastise the nation and to fulfil His larger ends is beyond the prophet's message, because He is concerned with the primary issue; and this has made him a dogmatist of the reality of conscience and the God of conscience.

It is, again, instructive to compare Amos' attitude on this subject with that of Zephaniah. The later prophet, as has been said, foretells a day of the Lord which is to befall the Philistines, Moab and Ammon, Ethiopia and Assyria. Now, the general view has prevailed that, as Amos' prediction was prompted and motived by the peril from Assyria, so Zephaniah's prediction arose from the appearance of the Scythians on the borders of Palestine. Then the order, in which he grouped the peoples on which the judgment was to fall, is taken to indicate the route along which the threatened invasion is to come. According to this view, the invaders were to come

from the North; and, after dividing themselves into two bands, one of which followed the route of the Philistine coast, while the other marched down the eastern side of Jordan by way of Ammon and Moab, were to reunite for an attack on Ethiopia.[19] But two difficulties have always lain in the way of this explanation. The one is that, so far as we know, Palestine really had as little to fear from the Scythians in the time of Zephaniah as it had from the Assyrians in the time of Amos; and, in fact, did not suffer at all from their incursions. The other is that the route proposed, by way of the Maritime Plain and the east side of Jordan at the same time, was in the highest degree unlikely, and that, even if it had been followed, it would fail to explain why Nineveh was placed by the prophet alongside Ethiopia, which on this theory was the goal of the whole march.[20] In reality Zephaniah was following Amos. Like him, he foresaw the day of the Lord, and was engrossed by the fact that it was a day in which Jahveh manifested His righteous order in a world which greatly ignored Him. But what instruments Jahveh might use was of slight importance to the prophet. What it concerned him to bring home to the conscience of Judah was that the eternal order, which is an order of perfect righteousness, was breaking in upon the world-order which men knew.

The same vagueness which characterises Amos' description of the instrument Jahveh is to use, characterises also his description of the ruin which is to result from the judgment. In two passages he speaks of it as captivity (vii. 17, v. 27). But captivity to Amos means no more than the reversal of the work of Jahveh on behalf of His people. Thus the Syrians are threatened with captivity to Kir (i. 5), out of which Jahveh once brought them (ix. 7). Israel also shall be led captive out of its land, which was once the land of the

Amorites and the gift of its God at the conquest (ii. 9 ff.). In both cases Jahveh is about to undo His work on behalf of these nations.[21] When Israel is further threatened with a captivity beyond Damascus (v. 27), what is implied is that in this day of the Lord they shall wander farther than they did when Elisha stirred up Hazael to harry them, and shall be flung beyond the limits of their political horizon into the unknown.

It confirms the impression that Amos is not thinking of literal captivity to notice that another picture of the ruined nation appears in his prophecy. A nation shall afflict them throughout their land (vi. 14), sparing none (ii. 14–16), and wrecking their homes (iii. 15). The virgin of Israel is fallen, the city that went forth a thousand shall have a hundred left and that which went forth a hundred shall have ten left (v. 2 f.): there is something after the overthrow. When Jahveh's judgment is finished, city and country are filled with wailing (v. 16 f.): some are left to wail. It is a pitiful remnant;—'as the shepherd rescueth out of the mouth of the lion two legs or a piece of an ear, so shall the children of Israel be rescued' (iii. 12);—but it is a remnant, left in the land, on which Jahveh may yet have mercy should it recognise the meaning of His chastisement and turn to seek Him (v. 15).

It is impossible to get from the prophecy a clear picture of the nature of the calamity which is to befall Israel, and to see whether it is to be captivity or a wasting war: all that is made certain is that the nation is to cease from being a nation. The reason for this uncertainty is that Amos has come burdened with a different message, which does not require for its reception either in the prophet or in his hearers any definite knowledge of the calamity which is to bring Israel's national life to an end.

It is equally impossible, and for a similar reason, to frame

any clear picture of Amos' view as to the future of Israel. The prophet does not believe that any action on the people's part can avail to turn back the impending catastrophe. He himself has ceased to pray that this may be turned back, for he knows that the divine patience has been exhausted. His business is now to announce the immitigable purpose of Jahveh.

But this does not imply that the divine purpose is exhausted in the day when Jahveh intervenes to shake down the order of things men know. While Jahveh makes an end of the sinful nation and breaks the instrument which has failed Him, He makes also a new beginning. Every intervention on the part of Jahveh has that as its result; and, while its first result is to shake down everything which is opposed to it, it means finally the emergence of the divine order, for Jahveh is the everlasting Creator of new things.[22] When Jahveh chastised the nation, it was in order that they might better learn His will: when He brings the national life to an end, it is still that His will may be better known and done in the world.

And so, if the poor remnant which remains from the overthrow turns to Him who smote them (v. 15), it may be that they shall find a place in the new thing which Jahveh is bringing to pass. Amos adds no more than this, not because the call to repentance is not seriously meant by him,[23] but because he does not have the charge to announce the new thing Jahveh is about to create, and so cannot tell what place the remnant may find there.

The remnant of whom Amos speaks is very different from the remnant of Isaiah. The later prophet, when he came to utter his specific message, gave this title to the men who in evil times and amid many troubles clung to faith in their God and His will, and to such men Isaiah could naturally

promise a sure place in any new thing which Jahveh was bringing to pass. But the remnant of Amos is the poor refuse of the people who escape because they are negligible (iii. 12). Because their capacity to learn from what they have experienced is so uncertain, the prophet's promise to them can only take the form of a 'may be.' Yet if they can in the new order which Jahveh creates learn the lessons of the awful past, and serve themselves heirs to the divine purpose, they may be used as their fathers, before they became a nation, were used to serve that will which alone endures in the world.[24]

Again, Amos does not dwell upon the future of his people, because it is not necessary for the specific work he has come to do. Neither the instrument which Jahveh shall use for His judgment, nor the course which the judgment shall take in Israel, nor its ultimate issue in the nation, is that which the prophet is commissioned to reveal. What he announces is the source from which the judgment comes, its irreversible character because He is what He is, and the fact that it is at the door. Jahveh has dropped His plummet down the wall (vii. 8): from the time when He chose to make known His verdict, the issue in the people's life was clear.

II.

What, therefore, Amos believed himself commissioned to declare was that Jahveh was about to intervene in the world-order, that this intervention was to issue in the overturn of the established order, and was in particular to visit Israel because Jahveh chose it and knew it. He believed that his commission had come to him through direct personal divine revelation, and has stated this in plain terms (iii. 7). But, because his whole attitude is so little that of the mystic,[25] we

are justified in asking, and are even compelled to ask, what brought him to this conviction. And Amos himself gives at least a glimpse into the working of his own mind. He states how, before he came forward to announce the imminent catastrophe, he had not failed to be interested in the destiny of his nation and in the purpose of Jahveh toward it. When Jahveh was about to contend with the people by fire and by locusts (vii. 1–6), Amos prayed for them, not on the ground that their penalty was unmerited, but on the ground that the people was small. 'And the Lord repented and said: this shall not be.' What stops the prophet's mouth at the third intimation of the divine uprising for judgment can only be his conviction that the divine patience is now exhausted. But that which exhausts the divine patience is the enormity of the people's sin. Either this has increased, since the hour when Amos prayed for them, or the prophet has seen more deeply into its nature. In any case it is the people's sin which brings the interference of its God.

It is therefore too strong a statement to say[26] that Amos reasoned back from his own certainty of an immediate judgment to the greatness of the national sin. His very language does not agree with this conception. We know how men are apt to write, we know as a matter of fact how the post-exilic men did write, when they concluded from an adversity which was either announced or in progress, to a sin which caused it. They pile up commonplaces to describe a sin which is not a burden on their conscience but a conclusion from their theology, but they do not write in words which bite on the conscience like the words of Amos. His detailed account, his singularly personal view of that in which their sin consists, his concrete description of certain sins which are prevalent among certain classes, all point to the fact that he was conscious first of how fatal these things were to the

nation. And thus, while it is true that the perception of the national sin, the conviction of the near end to the people and Amos' sense of his commission as a prophet, hang so closely together that it is difficult to say which is prior in the prophet's mind, the much greater probability lies on the side that he had seen behind all this human order an eternal order, the nature of which was righteousness, which might, at any hour God willed, manifest itself in this world. And when the people had so defied the will of their God as to make His choice of them futile, Jahveh must intervene for His self-vindication and for the vindication of the purpose He had in choosing them at all.

Jahveh, according to Amos, holds a relation to all the nations: He brought the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir. Jahveh is a free, self-determining power who can make of any people His instrument. But Jahveh has entered into a peculiar relation to Israel, such as justified the prophet in saying in the name of God, 'You only have I known among all the families of the earth' (iii. 2).[27]

In this the prophet's view and that of the people largely coincided. It was no new thing to them that Israel's relation to Jahveh rested on the fact of the divine choice of Israel to be His people, for the prophet and the people were at one in the opinion that Israel belonged to Jahveh (vii. 8, 15, viii. 2). In its own estimation Israel was the chief of the nations (vi. 1), and this self-estimate was due to their confidence that so mighty a God had elected them (iii. 2), and had given them their place. To be His choice was to occupy a privileged position. Their cult in itself was not the final source of the people's confidence: the final source of their confidence lay in this, that Jahveh had chosen them and had once intervened on their behalf.[28] Hence the more devout among them longed for the day of the Lord (v. 18). It had

been already, the day in which their God revealed Himself to create His people: when it came again, it would deliver them from all their troubles, and reveal to the wondering nations and to hesitating men what God can do for His own.[29]

Amos, also, based everything upon the initial act of Jahveh's choice, but he saw it from a different point of view. He did not insist on the time when the special relationship to Israel was formed, where it had its inception, under what conditions it took its rise. In part this may be due to the fact that he takes it for granted that these things were known to the people already; but far more is it due to his desire to point out what these things imply. Jahveh brought the people out of Egypt, He led them through the wilderness, He cast out the Amorites before them (ii. 10, v. 25); He gave them for their guidance nazirites and prophets (ii. 11). All these things proved that Jahveh held a peculiar and intimate relation to this people. All He has done for them was a deliberate and sustained act of self-conscious will, and as such, revealed in the very nature of things a purpose. Everything Jahveh has done for Israel and in Israel, He has done for something more than Israel's sake: He has poured out His benefits on this people that thereby He may make known what He is, and may mould Israel into an instrument of His will. What Jahveh's purpose was could only be learned through the humble and constant recognition of the nature of Him who had thus revealed Himself in His acts for Israel's sake. For this also Jahveh had provided, since, no sooner had He given Israel a place in the world, than He raised up nazirites and prophets to make clear the will of the God men were to serve there (ii. 11). To know and serve the will of their God was the very reason for their possession of the land, and therefore, while the Philistines came

from Caphtor and knew not why, Israel was led to Palestine and told the reason of their coming. But they thought to keep the land and to stifle the voice of the prophets (ii. 12). When Israel failed to learn from His benefits, Jahveh sent calamities upon them; and the calamities were meant for the same end as the benefits, to hold the people to the fulfilment of the will of their God (iv. 6–13). But the people have not been willing to learn through these deeds which have taken place in their midst. Jahveh had the right to expect from this nation a recognition of His signal conduct toward them; and He had not found it (ii. 9 f., iii. 2).

Their sin, accordingly, is treachery to the common purpose which bound God and people together, and by it they have dishonoured His holy name which has been revealed in and through them.[30] It is not merely a God who is identified with perfect righteousness whom they have flouted: it is Jahveh, who chose them to set His name there, and who meant to perfect good in this one nation. All the relations of their common life in Palestine were meant to be the means by which Jahveh's nature and will were made known; and these profaned relations are now their condemnation. The prophets He raised up they have silenced, the nazirites He sent they have led to break their vows, the land He gave they have defiled, the gracious relations of men to one another in their mutual life, which was interdependent and all-dependent upon Him, they have made hideous. The nation no longer expresses anything more than any other nation which Jahveh guides, as He does the Syrians and the Philistines. Nay, it expresses something less, for it is an embodied failure.

Jahveh is about to make a new beginning. Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel (iv. 12), in this new self-manifestation of Himself in the world. The catastrophe which is about to

come is no slow process working itself out through the inevitable issues of a broken law: it is Jahveh who is rising up to shake terribly an earth with which He has borne too long, and who will especially shake down this proud nation which was there to express His will and which failed even to realise its mission. Jahveh gives up His relation to His people, and in doing this He is just, so just that He can summon the nations to see His deed and to be the witnesses of His justice (iii. 9). In this representation of Jahveh as judge and accuser, and of the nations as the witnesses of His act, is expressed the recognition of how Jahveh is compelled to do this thing by an inner necessity of His nature. Even these aliens must acknowledge how He can do nothing else than the thing He now does, surrender the nation which He made. The wounded love of God, who has spent so much and whose patience is at last exhausted, must now make its way in the destruction of the nation which has failed Him.[31] Jahveh is not here the judge who vindicates His law; He is the Ruler and Sustainer of all who vindicates Himself.

It is when one recognises this great idea which possesses the mind of Amos, the idea of a God, who has Heaven and Sheol at His command, and who disposes of the nations to fulfil His righteous ends in the world, involving the idea of a nation which has the self-confidence and the grave humility of those who believe themselves chosen to serve an almighty will, and who seek to make that will real in all the relations of their national life,—it is when one recognises this that one can best measure the prophet's attitude to the cultus. It seemed to him a relatively small thing, so that he never formulated any consistent theory about it.

This assertion of course needs justification, and the justification lies in the different positions which the prophet adopts

in the matter according to the men whom he is addressing. In one passage (ch. viii.) Amos addressed the men who were at ease in Israel,—the class in every community and in every age which is most easily recognised. It is a difficult task to reconstruct the piety of a dead generation, because the unseen world of a man's aspirations and prayers is a great thing. It is never difficult to reconstruct the attitude of the worldling, because his world is small, and, whether he deals in wheat or in iron, whether he measures by the ephah or the ton, he wants these things for the same petty ends. He is the most unvarying, because the most commonplace, element in every civilisation. Amos saw him, rebelling against the cultus, because it formed a restraint on his appetites: 'When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn, and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?' (viii. 5). We know the man who frets against Sabbatarianism, not because its observances are in his judgment superstitious, but because he prefers to play golf rather than go to church, or thinks it a pity that the day of rest should interfere with his opportunities of making money. In speaking to such men, the prophet did not stop to inquire into the origin of sabbath and new moon, or to ask as to the legitimacy of their presence in the religious life of Israel.[32] Seeing how these forms of the cultus offered the boon of rest to the hard-worked poor,[33] he joined their neglect with the practice of making the ephah small and the shekel great in his vehement indictment against the wealthy and powerful in Israel. Because the observance of these days could help forward the ideal which was in his mind, and because the neglect of them was due to a contempt for the spiritual and moral principles which formed the basis of the national life, he condemned the men who ignored the regulations of the cult.

When, however, Amos is speaking in ch. vi. to the same

class in the community, he has nothing to say about their undue observance of a ritual form of worship. The reason may simply be that men of this type never need to be warned against undue observance of formal acts of worship, because they are rarely so interested in worship as to abuse its outward forms.

The men, before whom Amos brings in ch. v. the question of the origin and worth of the sacrifices, are in a very different case. They are those who desire the day of the Lord. They are men who are conscious that the relation of Israel to Jahveh is unsatisfactory, who are therefore not at ease, because they desire some manifestation of the God whom they worship. Meantime, until Jahveh intervenes to show Himself more clearly, they eagerly offer sacrifice to propitiate their God and to show their devotion to Him. Amos declares that when the day of the Lord comes, it will in no wise turn to their contentment. They are ill at ease now; but to desire the day of the Lord is like fleeing from Scylla to fall into Charybdis (v. 19). For Jahveh, when He comes, will come to judge and sweep aside the very means they use to serve Him: He hates and despises their feasts and offerings (v. 21–23). There was a day of the Lord in Israel, when He led them through the wilderness and smote the Amorites before them; but that was a day when Jahveh gave them no commands as to the sacrifices they should bring and the method in which these should be offered (v. 25).

Now the verse is very difficult to interpret. Plainly, when Amos asked this question specifically of the devout men of his time, he did not believe that an elaborate sacrificial system dated from the Exodus; for, if the men had been able to retort that their fathers worshipped after the punctilious and divinely commanded fashion which is

set down in the books of Exodus and Leviticus, the prophet's rebuke would have lost all force. But this does not make it much clearer what he does mean; for, if we are to understand that he believes that no sacrifices at all were offered in the wilderness, his view is simply incorrect: and J, who makes sacrifice not only as old as the desert but as old as the race, has a true historical vision compared with the prophet.[34]

What Amos seems to mean is that then the nation were in such a relation to Jahveh, so consciously dependent on Him and so much an instrument for carrying out His work, that they could rejoice in His immediate presence. The day of the Lord, then, so welded them together in joyous readiness to seek Him and the land where they might serve Him, that sacrifice fell into a comparative insignificance. So insignificant was it in comparison with this other sense of their unity with their God that it could be said that Jahveh gave no command about it at all. But now it bulks to them as though it were everything, for it is conceived by them as the chief means by which they seek to realise their dependence upon their God and to fulfil His will. They have substituted this comparatively trivial affair for the greater thing which Jahveh had in view when He made them a nation. And so now, when Jahveh manifests Himself, ye shall take up all these things which ye have made for yourselves, and I will sweep you away, you and your means of worship together, into captivity.[35]

The same attitude, more of impatience with such minor matters than of condemnation, is seen in iv. 4 f. The section is generally set down as an isolated fragment of a longer passage which once dealt with sacrifice, but without sufficient reason. Amos bids the people multiply their sacrifices and increase their tithes, because this is the kind

of thing which they understand—'this liketh you.' He bids them play at the little regulations in which they delight, and go into detail as to the exact kind (leavened or unleavened), as to the exact quantity (every three days), of the offerings they bring. And then, abruptly checking himself, he flings up over against all this the thought of Jahveh which is engrossing his own mind and bringing an awe over his own soul. Jahveh has given them famine and pestilence, drought, blasting and mildew. He has complete command of all these things and has used them for the discipline and guidance of the nation. This God, so mighty, so terrible, Israel is about to meet, when He comes to renew all things in the world, and their only thought of how to meet such a God is that He will be interested in questions about tithes and offerings.

'Seek Me,' he says in another place; 'seek not unto Bethel, go not unto Gilgal' (v. 5). Amos, again, is not considering whether the sacrifices at Bethel are legitimate or illegitimate. He is contrasting the God of his own wonder and love, whose great acts the people remember as the ground of their confidence, with the God whose nature is thought of as being contented with the meticulous and pettifogging services which are offered at these shrines.

In all this Amos leaves it uncertain whether his meaning is that the sacrifices which the people practise are hateful to God in themselves, or are only hateful because they are being made the substitute for a worthier service, and so are hiding from men's eyes the neglect of righteousness. But he shows a certain impatient disdain of the whole subject which seems to suggest a negative attitude, not only to the ritual of his own day, but to any ritual of any day.

The power of a routine to express man's submission to an eternal law, a submission which is constantly renewed

because the need for it can never pass away, the value of a ritual to express a gratitude which men ought to offer as they remind themselves of the presence of Him to whom their gratitude is due, the gracious uses of an ordered service which does not leave a man to the natural longing and aspiration of his heart, but expresses the limitations which God's will must impose even on men's aspirations, from such thoughts Amos hurries away to his thought of Jahveh's mightier purposes which, as these are wrought out on a different plane, need a different temper of mind to recognise them. Part of this was due to the fact of his being a great personality who had seen one thing which it was his business to bring home with all his power to the conscience of his own time. Part of it is also due to the fact that Amos was not commissioned to reveal a distant future after the divine act of intervention, and think of how the gratitude men felt to their God and Protector was to embody itself directly. He came to declare that Jahveh was about to overturn all the settled order of things in Israel; and it could be no part of his work to foresee the task which the Deuteronomists were to undertake. The distinction, however, which Amos made between the different parts of the cult shows a deeper departure from the national religion. He blamed the neglect of those parts of the ritual which seemed to him to have a moral basis and to supply a spiritual appeal. The question as to the origin of these did not concern him at all: what interested him was their capacity to check men's greed and to teach men brotherhood. He also poured contempt on certain forms of ritual worship, because in them he saw nothing except a corrupt worship, capable of drawing men's attention away from the greater claims of God on their conduct. So soon as he took this attitude, he showed how he was losing hold of merely national religion and moving out

to the position of a universal faith. The national religion had always insisted, national religion generally does insist, the revived national religion of Deuteronomy insisted afresh, on a cultus which preserves the historic continuity of a people, which embodies the common ideals and aspirations which have guided its past. The moment the prophet insisted that the primary justification for any act of the cultus was that it embodied human ideals, answered to ethical ends which were for all humanity and recognised the moral needs of man as man, he parted so far with national religion and was on the way to a world-faith.

What is thus shown in the prophet's attitude to the cultus is equally present in his view of moral evil. On one side, it is true, he speaks of sins rather than of sin, and of sins of deed rather than of sins of habit; and so he has not, as Hosea has, the weary and heavy sense of how sore a thing it is for men to repent. But, while in this respect Amos is external in his view, it is necessary to emphasise how he never appeals to any law,[36] not even in addressing Israel which must have possessed some law. What he demands from Israel is righteousness as between men who are bound together as servants of the one God; and the men to whom he insists most in this demand are the powerful who were most tempted to ignore it. The terms in which he speaks of this—*mishpat* and *tsdhaqah*, i.e. judgment and righteousness—are never used in the sense of a formal righteousness, nor is failure to fulfil them construed as the transgression of a formal statute. They are used in the wider sense in which they include all morals.[37] "The righteousness which is to flow like a stream through the life of the people is to him not like any formal affair, nor is it the merely external application of prescribed principles and customary or ordered claims: it is righteousness in the

absolute meaning of moral power, the respect for personality in fellow-members of the one people which is the presupposition for the free and happy activity of all for the welfare of the community, which excludes the misuse of one's own power and the pursuit of private advantage to the disadvantage of another." [38]

In all this Amos is appealing to that which is the foundation of all law in any community. He expects to find it especially in the men who form the community of Israel, because they have lived together through the same history, have experienced a common discipline and have learned to work together under the inspiration of a mutual faith. But he does not expect to find it only in Israel. To him it is a presupposition that everything he claims in the name of Jahveh expresses a native sense of right which dwells in every man, and that everything which infringes such a claim is in a real sense unnatural. The patent proof of this is that he does not hesitate to condemn the acts which have dishonoured the other nations, though these acts have no reference to Israel, and to denounce upon these nations the judgment of Jahveh in the day of His intervention. It does not occur to Amos that these nations have no knowledge of Jahveh's nature or claims. He condemns their conduct, as one who knows that the standard to which he appeals will be acknowledged by them, and needs no rule other than the instinctive pieties of the human heart to enforce it. Good is not merely a concrete and positive thing, enforced by regulations and guarded by penalties: before it has become this, and before it can become this, it is something which expresses the inner nature of man and of God. God and man are thus, all unconsciously it may be, set together as possessed of an inward unity of nature; and this nature which is common to God and man is served by all that is in outward nature.

For God uses the outward world, its catastrophes and its blessings, to enforce the purpose which He is bringing to light in man; and in particular God moulded the outward world that He might manifest His purpose in the world through Israel.

The position implies that nature is sacramental, and involves great consequences, which are not in the line of the prophet's thought. Rather Amos thinks of nature as the mere background to the life and work of man, and so thinking, has broken absolutely with every form of religion which finds its ultimate authority in any of the outward events of nature. Within the universe is the world of man with his intimate relation to God, within mankind is the little world of Israel with its clearer knowledge of what this relation implies, within Israel is the prophet who is God's gift to interpret His purpose to His people. The high value Amos sets on prophecy is not denied but really affirmed in the scene at Bethel. His reply to Amaziah does not imply that he refuses to have anything to do with the prophets.[39] The priest at Bethel acted like the ordinary official: he sent a message of warning to Jeroboam which was his recognition of the power and danger of the prophets, and then he turned to get rid of his inconvenient visitor. He bade Amos run away and earn his bread at this kind of thing in Judah, where the authorities might tolerate such practices; in Israel the royal power was too strong to let men imagine they could draw any profit from their prophesying. Amos retorted that this kind of thing was irrepressible. It is possible to control men who earn their bread by prophecy and to bring the prophetic schools into leading-strings. But remember that, when you have succeeded in this, prophecy will break out somewhere else. See, I was earning my bread at my ordinary business, when Jahveh came to me and drove me out to say

what I have said and must repeat. As for you, who think to control prophecy by your police regulations, your wife shall be a harlot in the city. When Jahveh has something to say to the world and to His own people, He will find a man to say it: so immediate and sure is the relation of Jahveh to the soul of man. And when Jahveh has pronounced the thing which shall be, its coming is irreversible. It is the same conception of the prophet, as one who is irresistibly compelled to prophesy, which appears in iii. 8: 'Jahveh hath spoken, who can but prophesy?' When Jahveh has something to reveal, He cannot fail to find a mouthpiece.

In the same way prophecy is as great a thing to Amos as the destruction of the Amorites. Jahveh sent both. It was a great thing that Israel should have received its land as a gift from its God; but it was a greater thing that the people should know through the prophets what God meant for them when He gave them the land. The Philistines came up from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir, blindly serving a will which they were not privileged to know. Israel came up out of Egypt; and, because God gave them not only a land but prophets, they knew what their God had for them to do; their great sin consisted in the fact that they silenced this voice of God.

In all this the prophet to Amos is the interpreter of God's will through the relation to God, which is not confined to him but which in him reaches its full and highest expression. And what is of chief significance to Amos is, not the great events of Israel's history, but the interpretation of them through the men whom Jahveh raised up in His people. This, which was implicit in the earlier prophet's thought, Isaiah made explicit in his offer of a sign to King Ahaz (see p. 161, *infra*).

On the other side, the attitude which Amos took implies

that he has in essence broken with a national religion. The inward unity of nature, which the prophet takes for granted as the constant bond between God and man, is not confined to Israel or to the prophet the divine mouthpiece within Israel, for Amos has presupposed its existence in the king of Moab. Not only does the sin of the nations deserve and call for the direct intervention of Jahveh; but, even when Jahveh's intervention is concerned with the peculiar sin of His own people, the nations can be called on to recognise and approve its justice. From this it was but a step to conclude that, since the nations had this initial relation to Jahveh, the divine intervention must concern them also, not merely in the sense that they mutely suffer from it, but that they can learn its meaning to them. And in Zephaniah, the great continuator of Amos' thought, we find this conception dimly breaking through for the first time.

The judgment which Amos conceived himself commissioned to pronounce was a world-judgment, and not merely something which was to befall Israel. The religion which he held was based on a universal ethic, and was not merely a national religion. The two sides of his thought hold together; and, when they are grasped together, it becomes clear that the great leader of the prophetic thought of Israel was not groping about to find what Assyria might or might not do, to point out the feebleness of the forces which stood against the coming of the world-empire, or to explain the meaning of his people's defeat at the hand of Assyria. He came to declare what Jahveh must do, because of his knowledge of what Jahveh was. Jahveh had a purpose which concerned the whole world. Because this purpose was not something which Israel had conceived for itself, but was the expression of the nature of Him who controlled all things, it must one day stand up on the earth and manifest itself as the one enduring

reality in this changeful and uncertain universe. And when it did manifest itself, it must become the touchstone to test all mortal things, but especially to test the work of this nation, the one reason for the existence of which was that it was chosen to be the instrument of the divine purpose.

CHAPTER V.

HOSEA.

I.

ANY attempt which is made to put the thought of this prophet into systematic shape requires always to keep in mind three things.

The first consideration is the state of the text in which Hosea's utterances have come down. It is wise not merely to recognise in a general way, but to keep continually in mind, that the text is exceptionally bad. A great deal can be done, and much has been done, by brilliant suggestion, to restore the book to what appears its original condition. But every such suggestion rests—and the more apparently valuable it is the more surely does it rest—on some preconceived idea of what Hosea is likely to have said, or even on some idea formed from other study of what was probable in the way of religious opinion at the period at which the prophet wrote. Now, when such a text, reconstructed unconsciously at the secret dictation of a theory, is afterwards used to support the very preconception which led to the reconstruction, the commonness of this reasoning in a circle does not make the practice more legitimate. Only texts which are clear can be used as proof.

The second consideration is the character of the oracles. They are generally brief, and never, except perhaps in ch. ii., develop a subject, but bear the stamp of utterances flung out

in the heat of the moment to meet a particular situation. In this they show the character of the man who uttered them, as a man of strong emotions who thought as it were in jets and who uttered impressions. These impressions came through the influence of certain conditions of the life around him, which possessed his mind often to the exclusion of everything else. Now these conditions, which so deeply influenced Hosea's thought, are often unknown to us, and our ignorance ought to make us careful against being too sure in any pronouncement on the doctrine of the prophet. When Hosea speaks of the princes making themselves sick with the heat of wine on the day of our king (vii. 5), he seems to refer to some incident which was as well known to his hearers as it was to himself, but which is wholly unknown to us; yet the character of the incident has much to do with the judgment he passes on those who were concerned in it. When he reproaches the priests for being a snare at Mizpah and spreading a net at Tabor (v. i.), he refers to conduct on the part of the priests of Northern Israel which, were it known to us, would make much clearer his attitude to this official class. His references to political dealings with Assyria and Egypt (v. 13, viii. 9, xii. 2) leave us sure as to the fact but wholly uncertain as to the reasons which prompted such conduct; yet it is possible that the reasons may have had something to do with the prophet's hatred of the act. Why Gilead should be singled out as a city of them that work iniquity (vi. 8), whether the priests committed actual or spiritual murder on the way to Shechem (vi. 9), what was the place in which Ephraim dealt treacherously with Jahveh (vi. 7),[1] we do not know; yet it is evident that these local events and temporary conditions roused the prophet to strong protest. Now a man who is roused to action or speech by the circumstances of his own time is peculiarly liable to be misunder-

stood by a later generation which does not know intimately the conditions which prompted his utterances. Hosea spoke with passion to meet a situation which he saw: his auditors heard his words and construed them in the light of the actions which he condemned and with the limitations that were necessary. But we are always apt to lift his broken utterances out of relation to these conditions, to apply them universally, and to believe that in what he says about a certain set of circumstances we have his whole mind on the subject with which he was dealing.

The third consideration which needs to be borne in mind is that we have no right to conclude that the book, as we have it, is chronologically arranged: we cannot say that the oracles are arranged at all. When it is said, *e.g.*, that the prophecy reaches its climax in the denunciation of doom on Israel in ch. ix., and when this conclusion is used in order to exclude the possibility of Hosea having prophesied a restoration of Israel to the divine grace, what underlies this is the assumption that ch. ix. represents the final utterance of the prophet on the fate of his nation. Yet there is no justification for the assumption, since it is quite as possible that this so-called climax represents, not the final conclusion of the prophet, but an earlier denunciation which was modified in the light of a wider experience. Ch. iv., again, states that it is useless to denounce the nation as guilty, since the commons have been misled by their teachers, the priests. It is possible to see in this an early conviction on the part of the prophet, which gave place to the later opinion that people and priests were equally guilty: it is also possible to understand it as the expression on the part of an older and graver man that much may be condoned to the erring, because misguided, populace. But it is not legitimate to conclude that with this conviction Hosea began his ministry, merely because

the chapter stands at the beginning of his book, there being no reason to assume that the oracles are in chronological order.

In particular, this deserves to be insisted on in connection with chs. i. and iii., the chapters which relate Hosea's experiences with his wife. The mere fact of these two chapters following one another closely in the book must not prevent the recognition of how the revelations they contain may have been separated by a considerable interval of time, and represent a deepening experience on the part of the prophet. Hosea did not begin to speak as a prophet, only after all the bitter and gracious experience of his marriage had been gathered in.[2] His first child by Gomer bears a prophetic name, but the name contains no reference to his wife's unfaithfulness. Because this is so, the following oracle contains no reference to the people's faithlessness, but merely confines itself to denouncing woe on the kingdom for the sin of the house of Jehu. The two other children are given names which directly refer to convictions which sprang from Gomer's unfaithfulness: and in the symbolic names the prophet represents the woman's desert and the nation's desert because of their conduct towards those whose names they bear. But ch. iii. speaks of a new subject, the attitude of the prophet, as determined not by Gomer's conduct toward him, but by what his love to her prompts. This it is legitimate to construe as the outcome of a later period in Hosea's life, when he had learned a higher thought of his relation even to an unfaithful wife, with all therein implied as to the meaning of Jahveh's relation to Israel. The mere fact that the chapters are contiguous in the present form of the book does not shut out the possibility of this interpretation, for there is no just ground to believe that the oracles are arranged in order of time, so that

all Hosea's prophecies in chs. iv. ff. came after his experiences with his wife.

When the experience which qualifies a man for his prophetic function is one which is not exhausted in one great moment, but which by its very nature grows, it is inevitable that the prophetic message itself should change and develop. When Amos saw a basket of summer fruit, he needed no more than the explanation of what this implied for the people of Israel: with his faithful delivery of the message the experience of the prophet, so far as this revelation was concerned, was closed. But when Hosea was called to be a prophet, he was summoned through a human relationship which was not and could not be definitely closed. It was in itself a growing and changing thing, which unfolded its implications to the patient heart; and, being such, it implied that the prophet's revelation grew in depth as he himself came to know all that was meant for him by the life into which he had entered.

Volz has insisted[3] that this conception is mistaken, and that no more is implied in i. 2 than that Hosea was commanded by Jahveh to marry a woman who was already profligate in life, in order to point out to the people by this object-lesson what its real relation to Jahveh was. But, to say nothing of the difficulty of a prophet conceiving such a marriage to have been directly ordered by God,[4] the view breaks down on two sides. It destroys the analogy between Israel and Gomer; for Hosea does not think or speak of Israel as having been faithless before its union with Jahveh —he blames Ephraim for having become unfaithful after Jahveh brought it into His house, the land of Canaan. And it is impossible to understand how such a deed could arrest the attention of the people. Volz thinks that the startling marriage of a prophet with a woman of known bad

character could not fail to rouse the people's interest and to force them to ask its meaning. But, if we are to be just to the language of i. 2, Hosea was not publicly recognised as a prophet before his marriage; and it is not easy to see how the marriage of the unknown son of Be'eri with a profligate woman would incline his countrymen to listen to anything which he now had to say in the name of God.

II.

All that is known as to the personal character and history of Hosea is based upon the statements in his book. He was the son of an otherwise unknown man, Be'eri, and he married a woman, Gomer, who bore him two sons and a daughter, and whose faithlessness to him was a principal factor in his mission as a prophet. The latter statement has been questioned; but, while there is a great deal which points in the direction of a symbolical interpretation of the marriage, the fact that the name Gomer obstinately resists every effort made to turn it into a parable seems to show that we have here to deal with a real woman and a tragedy. Perhaps Hosea was not unwilling to make it possible to turn the whole transaction into a symbol, because he was more eager to have men recognise and ponder the divine truths which by this means were conveyed to him, than linger too long over the tragedy of his home life, which he only related because it was the means by which he reached the truths for himself.

It may be concluded that he was a native of Northern Israel, not merely because his chief interest lay in Ephraim and several of his references to Judah as apart from Ephraim are suspicious on critical grounds, but because he shows an intimate knowledge of the condition of the kingdom of the

ten tribes. He is not content to expose the internal corruption of his people and to detect the sources from which this sprang: he refers to the places where the corruption was most in evidence, and in connection with them he denounces acts which must have been known to his hearers, but to some of which we have lost the clue (x. 13–15, x. 9 f., ix. 15–17). He speaks about the hasty, panic-stricken resolutions of the natural leaders of his people like one who has watched what he describes and who has seen its effects. And that he spoke of a life which he shared, not of something with which he was merely associated as an onlooker, is supported by the general tone of his prophecy, for in his sharpest denunciations he has neither scorn nor bitterness. To some extent this is due to the character of the man, but in part it is also due to the fact that he felt how intimately the corruption of the national life was bound up with instincts and desires which were not in themselves evil. He spoke like one who saw the source from which the worst sins of the people arose, and who, while he condemned it, condemned it with sympathy.[5]

Duhm[6] held that Hosea was a priest. One would wish to believe it. His continual interest in the cultus and his sense of how the corrupt cultus was sapping the very foundations of morality become more explicable on this supposition, and his condemnation of the cult in itself and of the entire public conduct of the priests becomes also more trustworthy. It might be argued that the fact of Amos having been a man of the type which is never very dependent on a cultus, and therefore cannot really estimate its value, makes his sweeping judgments on that for which it stood in his time a little suspicious. One must have seen a thing from the inside and loved it before one has the full right to condemn it. But, while there is enough

in Hosea's book to make us sure that he had seen from the inside the work of the priests, both in connection with the sacrifices and in connection with their judicial functions, there is not enough to compel us to suppose that he was professionally identified with them. The prophets were, as we have seen, intimately associated with the priesthood—so intimately that there is no need to postulate more for Hosea.

The period of the prophet's activity falls a little later than that of Amos, but before the outward collapse of Samaria. The beginning of his work dates from the time when the house of Jehu was still upon the throne, for his earliest prophecy (i. 4) was directed against this dynasty. Since Zechariah, Jeroboam II.'s son, was only able to maintain himself for six months (2 Kings xv. 8), and since with his fall the house of Jehu came to an end, it is just to conclude that Hosea began to prophesy while Jeroboam was yet on the throne.[7] The *terminus ad quem* of the prophet's work is a little more difficult to establish,[8] but there is no sufficient reason for referring any utterances of Hosea to a period later than that of Israel's independence. This, however, does not imply that the ruin of the State was not already in process and that some part of it had not become apparent. The feeble kings who succeeded each other after the death of Jeroboam II., none of whom was able to maintain his seat on the throne, were equally impotent to secure the internal unity of their kingdom and to preserve it against its external enemies.

The greater part of Hosea's work accordingly fell in a period when the central authority was weak; and some of the results of that anarchy shine through the pages of his book. The petty kings, who ruled so long as their party held together and who represented no more than the intrigues

of the hour, maintained themselves by dependence on the foreigner or by appealing to the passions of their supporters: they were kings whom Israel made, not Jahveh. With this breaking down of the royal power went the last stay for decent justice. The kingdom had weakened the older system by which justice was administered among men in Israel; and now, when the kingdom itself was weak, the judges it could not check did what pleased them. Every greedy appetite was loose in Israel: the people was masterless, and losing every ideal which could make it a nation.

Hosea, like Amos, came to announce an intervention of Jahveh, in which the God who had once revealed Himself for the creation of this nation was to reveal Himself anew in its history. The interest of Hosea, however, as we shall have occasion to notice more clearly later, was almost wholly confined to the action of Jahveh within Israel, so that the divine intervention, as implying a judgment upon the nations and a convulsion which affects their fate, does not appear in his thought as it does with his predecessor. But the idea of a wider divine intervention, implying a catastrophe which was to embrace more than his own land, is fundamental in his prediction. Thus he describes the Lord's controversy in terms (iv. 1–3) which resemble the language of Zephaniah, and predicts it as bringing about a change in the whole animate creation. No ordinary convulsion, such as a drought, far less a conquest by the foreigner, can make the fishes of the sea suffer: this convulsion is to affect the brute creation as well as mankind. And when he represents the new order which is to follow on the divine intervention, he speaks of how Jahveh shall remodel the relations, not merely of men to each other, but the relations of Israel to the world in which it lives, so that the people shall dwell at peace with the beasts (ii. 18–20), and both man and beast shall rejoice in a new fertility of the

earth where they live together (ii. 23 ff.). To this it will be necessary to return later. Meantime, it is important to recognise that the appearance of the conception of the world-catastrophe, in such different forms and in two prophets of so different character as Amos and Hosea, proves the idea to have been widespread in this period.

Moreover Hosea, as little as Amos, is watching the slow and irresistible rise of the Assyrian power or drawing conclusions as to Israel's powerlessness to resist an invader from the increasing anarchy in Israel. To him also the one adversary whom Israel has to fear is Jahveh: 'I will be unto Ephraim as a lion . . . I, even I, will tear . . . I will carry off, and there shall be none to deliver' (v. 14). But who or what is to be the instrument for the divine purposes he nowhere states.

It is true that he has much to say about Assyria and Egypt as powers that are to chastise Israel, and that he expressly mentions Assyria, while Amos nowhere introduces that nation. He mentions together Assyria and Egypt (ix. 3, xi. 5,[9] 11); he speaks sometimes of Assyria alone (x. 6), sometimes of Egypt (ix. 6), as lording it over Israel. But the fact that the prophet mentions the two powers together makes it impossible to suppose that, when he spoke at one time of Egypt and at another of Assyria, he was dealing in each separate prophecy with a different historical and political situation, and foretelling now one, now another, of these powers as the final instrument of the divine wrath on Israel. Thus he announced (ix. 6 [10]) that, when the people were driven from their wasted country, Egypt was to gather them up and Memphis to be their rendezvous; but in the same breath he declared (ix. 3) that Israel was to eat unclean food in Assyria. These two verses cannot indicate a different historical and political situation. And, when it is noticed that the threat

of chastisement from one or both of these nations is joined to the fact that Israel sought help at their hands instead of from Jahveh, their true helper, it becomes clear that the prophet meant to say that they shall be bitterly disappointed in the saviours to whom they have turned in the hour of a need which their God sent in order to teach them to turn to Him alone.

Whenever Hosea announced the final overthrow of the people, he announced it as something which was to be carried out by Jahveh Himself (v. 14, vii. 12, viii. 13, ix. 12, x. 10). The God who gave them their land was to cast them out of it; and, as Hosea did not stop to dilate on the means by which God conquered the new land for His people, he did not interest himself in the means by which God was to cast them out. It was enough to say that the source from which their chastisement came was Jahveh Himself.

Hosea's mention of the world-powers has a different significance. The prophet is constant in his recognition that sin brought its own penalty and carried, wrapped up in it, its own catastrophe. The people have sinned in that they who owed everything to Jahveh have preferred another lord than Jahveh, and have sought another protector beside Him (v. 13, etc.). They shall have their wish: they shall be abandoned to an alien government. It matters nothing to the prophet whether their lord was to be Egypt or Assyria, any more than it mattered to him whether they offered their allegiance to Egypt or Assyria. It was enough that they had turned to serve another than Jahveh: and it is enough that He means to abandon them to the lord whom they have chosen. Assyria and Egypt have become symbols. The fact that Hosea sometimes employs the two names in the same passage, and the other fact that he shows a preference for Egypt in this connection, though Egypt was not interfering in Palestine during this period, and was not

therefore likely to be a danger to the nation, are the proof of the meaning he attached to these two names. Israel was to return to the condition out of which Jahveh brought them. No longer Jahveh's bride, nor suffered to dwell in the Lord's land, they shall live without the means which brought them into relation to the God to whom they owe their existence (iii. 4, ix. 3 f.). 'My God will cast them away . . . and they shall be wanderers among the nations' (ix. 17).

What interested Hosea was not the form of Israel's chastisement, nor the means by which it was to be brought about: it was the fact that this was to be the deed of Jahveh, and that, when it was done, they sank back into the condition from which He alone had been able to call them. To Him they owed their national existence and their distinctive character: when they forgot Him, they returned to the grey, insignificant heap out of which they came.

III.

The commanding thought in Hosea is the love of God to Israel. To this love Israel owed its existence as a nation: 'I am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt' (xii. 10); 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and from Egypt I called My son' (xi. 1; cf. also xiii. 4, ii. 17). Israel's existence as an independent nation coincided with, and was due to, the act of God's love which created it.

The love which prompted this deed was free, and Hosea did not think of seeking a reason for it. Once he quoted from a temple song of Bethel (xii. 4–7)[11] which described the divine care for the patriarch; but he did not use this in the fashion of a later generation, to insist that Israel was loved for the father's sake. Jahveh was gracious, as one is gracious to a child who owes everything to the care without

which it cannot live (xi. 3). When Jahveh found Israel in the wilderness, they were as delightful to Him as grapes to a thirsty wayfarer (ix. 10). No motive is offered here for the love of God, for it was the divine love which brought Israel into the wilderness: what is said is that, while they were there, dependent on His sole power and knowing no other allegiance, they were delightful to Him.[12]

But this initial act on Jahveh's part did not exhaust the divine care. When the time of childhood with its weakness and dependence was past, Jahveh brought the people into His land and gave it a place, and with a place an opportunity. The land was His land (ix. 3) and all its gifts were His gifts (ii. 10 f.). With the settlement in Canaan began the period of marriage, when the people, no longer in its childhood, was called to live in Jahveh's house and to bear His name. Here was its opportunity to own Him as the Lord of its life.

This is the explanation of the apparent discrepancy between the conception of Israel as a child and as a wife, which has led several exponents of the prophet to question the originality of 'My son' in xi. 1, on the ground that Hosea construes all the relation of Israel to Jahveh as that of a bride to her husband. In reality, Hosea believes and teaches that Jahveh did not merely love Israel when it was full grown, and did not choose the nation already in its proud independent strength to bear His name. The divine love gave the people everything—being, place, and name. Israel to Hosea was not an independent power, to which Jahveh elected to enter into an intimate relation, and which could therefore assert an independent position and certain rights over against the claims of its God. The prophet conceived Israel as owing its very being to a love which, when it had brought the nation into existence and

cherished it into strength, added this also, that it chose the people to bear Jahveh's name before the world.[13]

Hosea has only one title for God: he calls Him by a proper name, Jahveh, the name which only Israel knew and which Israel bore as its proud distinction. He was Israel's maker (viii. 14), Israel's God (ix. 1). The deeds of Jahveh on which the prophet dwelt were the deeds He wrought for Israel. He called the people out of Egypt (xi. 1); He taught them to go (xi. 3); He was their God from the land of Egypt (xii. 10). He gave the nation a land (ix. 3, 15) and their priests a law (iv. 6). Their institutions were of His appointment and bore His sign. Because the priest had rejected knowledge, Jahveh rejected him from being His priest (iv. 6). The sacrifices were Jahveh's offerings (viii. 13). The prophets were His prophets, sent to hew the people by the words of Jahveh's mouth (vi. 5). Their kingdom was meant to be an expression of His will, for the fault which is found with the kingdom is that they have set up kings, 'not by Me' (viii. 4).

These are not merely the acts of Jahveh on which Hosea dwells: they are the only acts on which He dwells. One is conscious throughout of a different horizon from that of Amos in his speech as to the nature and the work of Jahveh.[14] There is here nothing of the God who brought up the Philistines from Caphtor, as well as the Israelites from Egypt; and there is no thought of a relation of God to the world which can conceive the sins of the nations as being, equally with those of Israel, transgressions against Jahveh. It would be a mistake to conclude that Hosea conceived the power of Jahveh as more limited than Amos had done. To him also Jahveh's power, when it is put forth on behalf of His people, is absolute: He could bring Israel out of Egypt; and He would restore the broken order of the

world in the end (ii. 20 f.). But the interest of the prophet lay in a different direction. What dominated his thought was what Jahveh has shown Himself in Israel, and is about to show Himself in Israel.

The world-powers were but great shadowy things which God used for His purposes on Israel. They were not even judged; they were merely used for an end which they could not know. To Hosea the nations were lumped together as the *go'im* (viii. 10, ix. 1), who have nothing distinctive save their common difference from the chosen people. Already the nations have come to mean the heathen.

Hosea had the conception which gave, and, it may be added, which will always give, its just strength to every particularist movement like Pharisaism. What interested him was no theoretical monotheism, framed in the interests of a theory, and therefore apt, like many products of the intellect, to become barren. What engrossed all his thoughts was the historic religion which had made his nation what it was, which had given it a different genius from all the other nations among which it lived, and the loss of which would mean the loss of a great thing from the world. He did not speak of a God who was Lord of heaven and earth, but of One who had come into contact with this people, who revealed Himself through the deeds which had made the people's history and through the institutions which moulded its life. He believed that Israel in a unique way knew Jahveh, and that this knowledge was in itself the proof of the greatness of His love for it.

IV.

Hence Hosea personified the nation. He thought of it in the light of the mission it was chosen to fulfil, and of the

end it was to serve in the world. It was Jahveh's bride to bear His name before men. He thought of the nation as a unity with a soul of its own which ought to pursue one purpose, and which therefore could be endowed with a personal will (iv. 16, vii. 11, x. 11). He thought of its institutions, not as arrangements to satisfy temporary needs, but as means to fulfil divine ends and to satisfy a personal will.

Israel's history in all its phases, since the day its God created it, showed one unique reality: it was the history of God's love to it—a love which chose the nation in order that it might serve one end. The motive for that love was not to be found in anything which Israel had done; for Israel was not, until this love created it. And as the motive for this love lay in the nature of God Himself, it was unchanging in the end for which it acted. As Hosea saw the history of his people thus in the light of a love which urged it continually to a great end, history became to him symbolic. Each fact in the people's history is to him translated into something more than a bare fact, and "each fact of the past is at the same time . . . a prophecy of the future." [15]

The great facts of Israel's past history became symbols of spiritual realities. Through them the eternal order manifested itself in the world, because in them was embodied the relation which existed between Israel and its God. Because of this, Egypt, with a return to which Hosea threatened the people, was not primarily the historic kingdom on the Nile; nor does it help us greatly in the interpretation of the prophecy to know the exact relations which existed, at the time when the prophecy was written, between the courts of Samaria and Memphis. For Israel to return to Egypt was to revert to the beginning, to go back into the earlier relation to Jahveh, before He made Israel His own. Hosea said the same thing in different

terms when he prophesied (ix. 17) that they should be wanderers, landless and masterless, among the nations, or when he denounced upon them the doom that the Assyrian, whom they had chosen to be their lord instead of Jahveh, should be permitted to work his will upon them (xi. 5).

Because Hosea saw the people like a moral personality, whose task it was to fulfil the end which the divine love set before it, he saw also only one sin. He could not write of three transgressions and of four, because of which Jahveh's wrath came upon His people. However widespread the ramifications of their evil were, and however varied its forms, they all sprang from a common root. The people have been unfaithful to Him to whose love they owed everything.

God made them a nation: He gave them a land, a law and prophets. He gave all these things for the definite end that the people which owed Him everything might be His bride and, living in His house, might bear and continue His name in the world. But the first use Israel made of its sense of independent power was to turn from Him. They came to Baal Peor, and, at the very threshold of the land in which they were to live as Jahveh's bride, they consecrated themselves to Baal (ix. 10).[16] They ascribed the new land, with its blessings of corn and wine and oil, to the baalim and not to Jahveh (ii. 7). From that moment they could not use these gifts for the purposes for which Jahveh gave them; and they became abominable, like that which they loved (ix. 10).

As Hosea stood in wonder before the unmerited love of God to Israel, so he stood in amazement before Israel's sin. This failure to acknowledge the divine love, which was the source of all their other shortcomings, was something he could not fathom. He spoke of it wonderingly — this whoredom which is found in Ephraim (vi. 10). It was in-

gratitude: 'I have strengthened their arms, yet do they imagine mischief against Me' (vii. 15). It was folly: 'Ephraim is like a silly dove without understanding' (vii. 11). It was treachery: 'Ephraim compasseth Me about with falsehood and the house of Israel with deceit' (xii. 1). But, whatever form it took, it was in itself so inexplicable, and withal so deeply rooted, that Hosea could speak of it as though it presented an insoluble mystery to Jahveh: 'O Ephraim, what shall I do unto thee?' (vi. 4).

In this there is a difference of tone between Amos and Hosea. Throughout his book Amos reasoned with Israel, like one who spoke to a public conscience and occupied common ground with those whom he accused. Hosea complains that those to whom he speaks lack knowledge of God (iv. 1, 6) and know neither the nature nor the will of Him whom they are seeking to serve. It was not that he took the attitude of one who brought a wholly new message as to Jahveh's will, for he reproached the people with having despised knowledge and with having forgotten the *torah* of their God (iv. 6). Because their ignorance was voluntary, it was blameworthy. Jahveh accused them on the very ground of their ignorance (iv. 1), for what caused their ignorance was their perverse conduct (iv. 11 ff.). The more detailed have been the instructions their God gave, the more slight has been their attention to them (viii. 12).[17]

The prophet stood over against them, as one to whom their position was incomprehensible: he was overwhelmed by the mystery of their ingratitude.

V.

But, further, because Hosea saw the life of the nation as that of a great personality, he saw also how the fundamental

attitude of neglect of Jahveh perverted all the relations of this life and the institutions in which the national life embodied itself. The whole life of Israel had fallen away from Jahveh. The moral rottenness of the kingdom and the priesthood, which made these great institutions a weakness and a curse, sprang from the religious attitude of the people itself, so that the means for sustaining the national life only revealed through their moral decrepitude the failure of Israel to fulfil its high and wondrous function.

It is from this point of view that we must interpret all Hosea's judgments on the several institutions of the nation and on the conduct of those who guided its policy and declared its justice. Even those judgments in which at first sight he seems to be speaking of merely political questions have this religious source. Israel owes everything to its God. He gave it its distinctive life and the land in which that life was to be lived. He made it His bride, that it might continue to bear His name among the nations, proudly acknowledging that it owed everything to His love. For Israel in the time of its perplexity to rely on political alliances was to deny the power or the care of its God. The prophet returns to this complaint again and again. Once (vii. 11) he seems to speak as though it were the inconstancy of the people in turning now to Assyria and again to Egypt, and the folly of such an inconstancy, which roused his anger. But other passages of his book prove that his anger would have been equally aroused though the people had chosen resolutely a single ally, and that his indignation was due to their having sought an alliance at all. When Ephraim goes to Assyria, it is as though he hired lovers—*i.e.* it is a sign of his unfaithfulness to his one Lord (viii. 9). 'When Ephraim saw his sickness, and Israel his wound, then went Ephraim to Assyria, and sent to the great king' (v. 13).[18] Israel owes

its all to Jahveh, who has set the people in Palestine to fulfil His own ends. For the nation to go in days of peril to Assyria for help is to question the power of Jahveh to maintain what He has given and to continue what He has begun.

Further, when Israel ascribed its possession of the land to the baalim, it gave the products of that land to the service of the baalim (ii. 10, 14).[19] When Israel turns for aid to another power, and holds its land at the will of Assyria or Egypt, it must hold it to serve the bidding of its master. Its unique character, as holding everything from Jahveh to serve Jahveh's will, is lost. It becomes mixed among the nations (vii. 8), only one among the many, possessing no distinctive position and bearing no distinctive testimony. 'Israel is swallowed up: now are they among the nations as a vessel in which there is no pleasure' (viii. 8). Hosea is not there uttering a prophecy of banishment: he is describing an actual condition. When they hold their land at another's will, and are bound to do the bidding of the new master whom they acknowledge, they have lost the distinctive character of Jahveh's bride which they had when Jahveh set them in this His land to serve no will save His. From this point of view, it is a matter of indifference to Hosea whether Assyria protects them or betrays its dependents: their attitude to the foreigner has made them his servant, and to become his servant is to cease to be Jahveh's bride.

It is, of course, necessary to remember that in this, as in much else, we often fail to appreciate that alien and distant world. For us, alliance with a foreign power, even when the nation which seeks the alliance is in need of help, leaves the inner ideals of the dependent people uninfluenced, except in subtle ways which are difficult to trace. But in that early time, dependence on the foreigner inevitably brought with it

some recognition of the religion of the superior State. Hosea was the less likely to ignore this, because he lived and worked in Northern Israel at a time when men presumably had not forgotten the effect of Ahab's alliance with the kingdom of Phœnicia. Yet it is equally necessary to recognise that this supplies only an element in the prophet's thought, and that to him reliance on a foreigner in itself carried with it a questioning of the power of Jahveh. Men who turned for help to any other than the God who had called their nation into life, proved thereby their distrust of the power of their God to continue His own work. That it must also bring with it the inevitable tendency to assimilate all their life to the type of life which ruled in the kingdoms to which they looked for help was a real danger, but was merely an aggravation of the original offence.[20]

Again, the people's failure to recognise that it held everything as a gift from Jahveh and as a means of serving His will, showed itself also in Israel's trust in its own power. This was the ground of Hosea's strong polemic against the kingdom.

There is no justification for the opinion that Hosea in his attack on the kingdom meant the Northern kingdom as contrasted with the Davidic dynasty,[21] and so was the first to voice the later conception which represented the division of the kingdoms as schism. The foundation of the prophet's view thus represented has been sought in the fact that he regarded united Israel as the bride of Jahveh, and so was bound to regard the division between North and South as a great sin. Fortunately, there is no trace of such an idea in Hosea's book, and we are spared the necessity of ascribing to the prophet the grotesque opinion that a bride could be divided into two, or that, if the poor creature could so divide herself, her act implied disloyalty to her husband.

Nor is there any justification for the opinion that Hosea condemned the kingdom on principle, as something which implied the rejection of the direct rule of Jahveh over Israel, and that by taking this position he helped to introduce the so-called theocracy. The chief support for this view has been found in the statement of the prophet that the Israelites sinned since the days of Gibeah (ix. 9, x. 9), in which passages the days of Gibeah are taken to mean the time when Saul was elected as king. But while it is true that Saul resided at Gibeah, he is not said to have been elected as king there in either account of the election which has been preserved: in one account he was chosen at Mizpah (1 Sam. x. 17–24), in the other at Gilgal (1 Sam. xi. 15). If, therefore, Hosea meant by his use of the 'days of Gibeah' to refer to the election of the first king, he must be charged with having chosen a singularly ambiguous phrase. And it is of even larger significance to notice that the prophet regarded the apostasy of the people as having come into existence from the time of their settlement in Canaan (ix. 10), not from the time of their new organisation in the land. Evidently the new institution of the kingdom was regarded by him as having merely quickened into stronger life seeds that were sown long before its date.[22]

To Hosea, the kingdom was the institution in which, on one side, the national life culminated. Because it embodied the national ideal, it ought to have expressed more clearly than any other institution the people's dependence on Jahveh, and, as a matter of fact, it does express most clearly their hopes and aims. Now it was the ruling class, with the king at their head, who were leading Ephraim to rely on the foreigner, and so to prove their distrust of Jahveh's power. Among them lawlessness and insolent pride and injustice came to their amplest expression. The princes of Israel[23]

have become no better than petty filchers of their neighbours' fields (v. 10): they have made their position into a mere means of self-aggrandisement. As Hosea looked at the condition of the centre of government, his spirit was filled with weariness and loathing to watch the whirligig of palace revolutions which were destitute of any principle and only represented sordid ambitions or petty passions.[24] The helplessness of the kings who won to power by such means was patent to all thoughtful men: 'the king, what can he do for us?' (x. 3; cf. also xiii. 10). Their distracted counsels, as they turned for help in their efforts at supporting themselves against their rivals, now to Egypt, again to Assyria (vii. 11), were evident.

In the impotence which had befallen them Hosea saw the divine judgment. Jahveh had overturned their kings, as He foretold the ruin of the house of Jehu (i. 3–5), in order that men might learn to turn to Him for help. But their first act was to proceed to elect a new king (vii. 7), the impotent puppet of their own passions. Their kingdom, so far as it was the outcome of their self-confidence and fed their self-reliance, was an evil thing. In this sense Hosea said that they have set up kings, but not by Jahveh (viii. 4). But that it was only in so far as it was the outcome and the evidence of the national temper that the office roused the prophet's alternate scorn and anger is seen in the way in which he always united the condemnation of the king with that of the people and passed so frequently from the one to the other (cf. especially viii. 4). This institution, in which one side of the national life found its expression, partook of the corruption which was in their hearts and showed most patently their real aims. It was a kingdom as Israel had made it; and it embodied, in its neglect of God's will for His nation, Israel's radical rebellion from its Lord.

Of the same character as Hosea's attack on the kingdom is his indictment of the priesthood. Here also the prophet attacks, not the priesthood in itself, but the priesthood as Israel has made it, and therefore as showing the lowered morale and debased ideals of a people which has forgotten Jahveh. Hence, the priests are united with the court in an indictment of the national life (v. 1 ff.;[25] cf. ch. viii.). These two institutions, which are such potent factors in the thought of the people, are also born out of its inward life and betray the fundamental aims on which it has set its heart. They are at once the outcome of its perverted ideals and the most powerful means through which these ideals are further perverted.

To understand the prophet's anger and disgust at the conduct of the priests, it is necessary to recognise that Hosea regarded the priesthood not merely, not even primarily, as the official representatives of the cult, but as having to do with the administration of justice,[26] and therefore as fulfilling the task of holding up before the people a divine law which concerned itself with right conduct. How strongly this view of the functions of the priests determines the prophet's sense of their importance in the national life and his condemnation of the way in which they have misled the men among whom they held these functions is to be seen in the fact that Hosea regarded them, equally with the court, as possessing *mishpat—i.e.* as having the right and the duty of declaring judgment (v. 1).[27] Accordingly, he was able to speak of their failure in fulfilling their functions as having resulted in deep moral and social confusion. Again, in ch. iv., Hosea showed what he regarded as having been the function of the priesthood in Israel. The people were destroyed through lack of knowledge; and the fault lay at the door of the priests, because they, having

put away such knowledge from themselves, caused it to die out in the nation (ver. 6). They must expiate their fault, for Jahveh will cause them to cease from being priests unto Him.

It was their business to declare the divine *torah* or law; and how greatly Hosea construed that *torah*, both in itself and in its influence on the people, is best seen through his making it parallel to the knowledge of Jahveh. That a prophet could not have spoken in such terms of the priestly *torah*, if he had believed it to be primarily concerned with mere regulations of the sacrificial cult is evident, just as it is clear that, if he had thought of the multitude of the *toroth* (viii. 12) as prescribing the meticulous details of the offerings, he would not have thought of Jahveh as their source. The *torah* of the priests was one great means by which the divine will expressed itself for the life of Israel.

Instead of declaring the divine law, the priests, says Hosea, 'eat the sin of My people, and set their heart on their iniquity' (iv. 8). Now the sin of the people was its calf-worship (cf. not only Hosea *passim* but Deut. ix. 21), in which the unspiritual worship which failed to understand the real nature of Jahveh came most clearly to expression. And what the prophet meant was that their incomes, made secure by pandering to a lower type of religion, blinded them to their duty of upholding that *torah* of Jahveh which really expressed His nature, and which it was their distinctive function as His priests to declare.[28] They have turned from this task to the easier and more gainful business of conducting the debased cult, because thereby they win their support from a people which desires a form of worship that involves little moral claim.

Not only have they, as a class, acted thus, and by so doing encouraged the people to set the claim of justice in Jahveh's name lower than an easily performed ritual, but

in their personal conduct they show how lightly they are able to sit to all moral claims. They have grown so shameless that they murder on the way to Shechem and commit lewdness (vi. 9); they are a snare at Mizpah and a net spread on Tabor (v. 1). Evidently Hosea is referring to some scandalous conduct on the part of the priesthood which was well known to the men of his own time, and into which he feels it unnecessary to enter further. The men do not acknowledge in their own lives the law which it was their business to teach to Israel. Their function was to represent the law of God which was Israel's distinctive heritage and through which Israel in the land that its God gave proved the sincerity of its obedience to Him. They have been content to let Israel's distinctive glory pass.

Hosea, however, did not attack the priesthood in itself. To him it was the means through which, as one of the great institutions which embodied the national life, the distinctive character of that life could have come to expression. By it, the knowledge of God as requiring justice and truth, loyalty and faithfulness, would have revealed itself. Through it, Israel would have voiced its sense that Jahveh was the supreme judge in its perplexed social and moral questions. But the priesthood, as Israel had made it,—like the kingdom, —only showed how radically the nation had parted with all real obedience to God.

To Hosea, who personified the nation and who saw it serving a common end, as it had its origin in a greater will, every institution within the nation, in which the national life expressed itself, ought to bear a distinctively Israelite stamp, and, since everything which was distinctive of Israel's life came from its God, ought to be marked by that which expressed Jahveh's will. Yet these institutions could not exhaust the prophet's conception of the relations which existed

between man and man in Israel and between Israel and Jahveh. He regarded Israel and Jahveh as forming one family, the bond of which could not be expressed in any covenant, drawn out in legal terms, because its bond was mutual *hesed*. *Hesed* on the side of Jahveh is that sure and unmerited goodness to which Israel owes everything: it is the divine generosity, what we call the grace of God. *Hesed* on the side of Israel as a community is, first and fundamentally, the grateful recognition of its debt, with the resultant loyalty which springs from the acknowledgment that men owe everything to a God who had His own purpose in all He has done for them. It is what Dr. G. A. Smith has called leal love—a love which issues in loyalty. But, because of this, which marked off the nation as having its peculiar mission and place, all the members of the community formed a family, and *hesed* governed their relations to one another as well as their relation to their God. Hosea's idea of kindness between man and man in Israel did not so much spring from the idea that this human relation was something which their God had commanded, and through the practice of which the people could prove their loyalty to their divine lawgiver: it was something more intimate. Israel was not merely the dominion of Jahveh, where He was King and where His rule was absolute: it was God's family, and, on that account, the bond which united Israelites to one another was like the bond which united them to their God. Their relations to one another were something more natural and spontaneous than could be expressed by obedience to a law: they were full of the same kindness which governs men who have been brought up in the same household, and who therefore have common memories and a mutual aim. Hosea could speak (iv. 1) of there being no *hesed* in the same breath in which he

spoke of there being no knowledge of God in the land. And it is useless to ask whether by *hesed* in the passage he meant loyal love to Jahveh or kindness to fellow-Israelites. The two for the prophet belonged together and implied one another. There could be no real love to God which did not bring with it love to all who were one's brethren in Jahveh's house. In this, as in so much else, Hosea must be judged as primarily a prophet. It has often been noted that (in iv. 2) he seems to speak like one who was already acquainted with the second table of the decalogue, for the sins which are there enumerated have a striking resemblance to the sins which are forbidden in the code. Yet, however this may be, it would be a mistake to suppose that he was basing his appeal on the decalogue. In the same way his work, like that of the other prophets, led to the sense of the need for a clearer statement of what constitutes the moral obligations of men to one another, and was sure to issue in the effort to frame a worthier law which could embody his requirements. But his conception of the relation went deeper than any legislation can ever reach, and dealt with matters which could never and can never be embodied in any code. He was speaking of that fundamental relation of men to God, and of those profound and simple realities which are needed as the common property of a people, if any code is to have a sanction for them.[29]

VI.

Hosea's profound sense of how the life of Israel was a unity, every part of which and every institution in which must express the will of God who called it into being, governed also his attitude to the cult. He could not treat it lightly as an unimportant thing in the way in which Amos

did. He saw what in its degradation it had done and was doing to pervert the mind of the people and to tear at the very vitals of the State. But he saw also what, if it had been purified, it might have done and might still do to impress the minds of the worshippers with the nature and will of the God whom they worshipped.

The searching nature of the examination to which he submitted the worship, and the persistence with which he returned to the question, prove how deeply he was impressed by the power which the cult had over the minds of men. He returned to it again and again, to show how it debased men's minds, and how it was a cause of the divine anger: and in so returning he proved his respect for it and his sense of its influence.

His condemnation of the cult of his time runs along two lines, which are not easy to separate, for the simple reason that the tendencies which he blames could not be kept apart, but fed one another. He reproached Israel with indulging in a syncretistic form of worship. When he said that Israel multiplied her altars according to the multitude of her fruit (x. 1), he probably referred to the way in which the nation's increased prosperity had led to greater pomp in its worship; but when he added that now their heart was divided (ver. 2), he could not mean that all these altars were in honour of Jahveh, but must mean that some were reared to alien worships. He declared (ix. 1) that Israel had gone a whoring from its God; and this, according to the prophet's idea of Israel as the bride of Jahveh, meant that the people were worshipping other gods. And these sayings support the authenticity of the verses in ch. ii. which describe Israel as having turned on their arrival in Canaan to the worship of the baalim, and iii. 1 which condemns them for their idolatry. Hosea found in the cult as Israel practised it a syncretistic

worship in which Jahveh was but one, though still perhaps the chief, among the gods whom the people acknowledged. To him, such a worship was unfaithfulness on the part of Jahveh's bride.

But Hosea also found a worship offered to Jahveh which was not to be distinguished in character from that which was offered to other gods. The sense of Jahveh's unique and lonely character—creator and supporter of the nation—had grown dim to His worshippers, and they found it natural to render Him a worship such as was offered to the other gods. The line between these two criticisms of the cult is difficult to draw in theory, because it must have been difficult to draw in fact. Whenever the sense of Jahveh's solitary greatness was lost, the people had less difficulty in associating other gods with Him in their reverence and in assimilating the worship due to Him to the worship offered to another god. And then the similarity of the rites helped in turn to blur the distinction and to bring Jahveh down to the level of other deities. Where one feels most clearly the crossing of the two lines of thought is in connection with Hosea's condemnation of the calf-worship in Samaria. It is possible that the people found in the calf a symbol of Jahveh, and believed that, in doing it reverence, they were offering their adoration to Jahveh Himself. But Hosea was not content to say that the calf was an unworthy symbol of the God whom Israel worshipped. He said it was from Israel, and a workman made it (viii. 5 f.), and so proved that it held to him no point of contact with a real worship. The worship which men could offer to such a thing, or even through such a thing, had no association whatever with the worship which was due from Israel to its own God. Israel's attitude to this, however it was construed, had nothing in common with the attitude into which Jahveh brought His people. "By this judgment

he proves the depth of his religious insight, for the whole history of religion shows that no truth is harder to realise than that a worship, morally false, is in no sense the worship of the true God" (cf. Matt. vi. 24, vii. 22).[30]

Of all this worship Jahveh was about to make a clean sweep. It was rooted in the land, and took hold of men's minds from the time when they came into possession of the land. Accordingly, one of the reasons why Jahveh must cast them out of the land was to get rid of it all. The only means to separate them from the worship which has become a part of their national life was that, in the national overthrow, the high places should be cast down, and the thorn and the thistle come up on their altars (x. 8). Jahveh must cast His people out of His house (ix. 3), and cause all their offerings to Him to come to an end (ix. 4).

But this implies no rejection of the cultus in itself. Nothing is more significant of Hosea's attitude than that he pronounced the absence of all worship a penalty, even the supreme penalty (ix. 4). Their bread shall be for their appetite, it shall not come into the house of the Lord: that was to be the result of their being cast out of Jahveh's house, and was more grievous than any mere expulsion thence. 'What will ye do in the day of the solemn assembly?' (ix. 5). All acts of worship, private and national, are to cease, because Jahveh has broken off relation to His people; and the life of the nation was thereby to become so much meaner a thing. They shall go with their flocks and their herds (evidently the means of sacrifice) to seek the Lord; and they shall not find Him: He has withdrawn Himself from them (v. 6). Hosea, as he thought of all this, thought of their life as a people, not merely as having lost something, but as having lost a great thing—the means of expressing how absolute was its dependence on God's mercy, and how deep was its

gratitude for His care. God was to Hosea the giver of the nation's life; and its life only remained at its highest when it retained the means of directly owning and renewing its dependence on Him.

One touches here a matter in which Hosea's sense of the divine love and of the gratitude which responds to such love gave him a new recognition of the worth of the cult. The Pharisees were puzzled—and since their time all the men whose religion is decently regulated and embodied in duties are puzzled—by the woman who poured the ointment on her Lord's feet. They did not feel for themselves the need to do anything which was so spontaneous and so individual; they did not know the ache in the loving heart until it has uttered its gratitude. A cult which gave room for this because it knew the wonder of the love of God, which marked the daily thanksgiving for a recurring mercy, and yet which left opportunity, through the vow and freewill offering, for the additional gift a man brought in his hour of relief or joy, has been apt to remain a difficult element in religion to all such men. Because to Hosea God was Israel's faithful Creator, because Israel's relation to God was that of grateful dependence, the prophet knew the value of the offering which man or nation brought in order that they might say openly and simply to their God how their hearts were quick with an emotion they could not fully express but could not stifle. He knew how each act of worship in which men owned themselves servants of their God's will and dependents on His bounty determined the temper of the spirit toward God and man. And it was finally a new temper which Hosea desired to see in Israel—a temper which would make certain things impossible, but which would make certain other things real.

So it was characteristic of Hosea that he did not say that Jahveh refused the offerings of the people, but declared

instead how Jahveh had more pleasure in the knowledge of His will than in burnt-offerings (vi. 6). All who press the early part of the verse, and read out of Hosea's great saying, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice,' an absolute rejection of sacrifice,[31] ignore the fondness of the Hebrew writers for such antithetic statements, and, it may be added, apply a criterion to the language of the Old Testament which they never think of applying to the words of the New. Jesus spoke on one occasion to His disciples of their customs of hospitality, and bade them, when they invited anyone to their homes, take special care not to invite the rich or their personal friends. He added that, if they did invite such men, a dreadful thing might happen—those who were invited might invite their entertainers in turn. Yet the evangelists who reported these sayings had no difficulty about relating how their Lord sat at rich men's feasts and accepted the invitation of a man like Zacchæus; nor do most readers feel much difficulty about recognising the purpose of such language.

When Hosea prophesied that the people was to be driven out of the land, he declared that thereby men were to learn how powerless were the baalim, to whom they had ascribed the corn, wine and oil, to maintain Israel in the possession of these gifts (ii. 5 ff.). The offerings to the baalim were to cease. Yet men were to be unable to offer these things to Jahveh, who had broken off His relation to them (ix. 4). Their common life was to be unblessed by the ascription of all that sustained it to God's mercy. Hosea was content to say that in a better time men's gifts should be spiritual: men shall take with them words, when they return unto the Lord, and shall offer Him the fruit of their lips (xiv. 3).[32] What their Lord desired was the allegiance of their heart. The offerings they brought were an insult, because their hearts were given away from Him. When they learned how good

and how life-giving a thing it was to acknowledge His hand in all and to depend on Him for all, they would learn also how dear to their God was a people which came with empty hands and a grateful heart.

It is easy to see how Hosea's attitude, though he himself was far away from such thoughts, supported the effort which was made to purify the cult. His conception of God was that of One who had entered into specific relation to Israel: his conception of Israel's position in the world was that of a nation which was separate from all the rest, and separated through its religion. The worship Israel offered must embody not merely something which was distinctive from that of the other nations, even as Jahveh to whom it was offered was unique; it must also embody the great historic facts of the divine love to Israel which made the distinction. His view of the people was that of a nation which was bound together by great memories, disciplined by common victories and defeats, and advancing to a common end. His view of its religion was that of a faith which expressed these common factors.

His insistence on the right knowledge of God tended in the same direction. For he had arraigned the worship offered in his own time on the ground that it expressed no right knowledge of the God to whom it was offered, and that it therefore made God like any of the heathen deities which the other nations served. Inevitably, when men laid his teaching to heart, they must seek to mould the great ritual acts by which the nation expressed its devotion to its God into forms which would embody true conceptions of Jahveh's nature and will.

His attack on the old ritual held a real sense of its influence and value, and therefore was fitted to lead men to seek, not its rejection, but its purification. And he insisted on the great truths in every historic religion which

have always underlain its ritual acts, and which have made them so gracious and so helpful an influence in the individual and the national life. In this respect he was one of those who did most to prepare the way for Deuteronomy.

While, however, it is true that Hosea's teaching supplied a great deal to the practical movement for reform, it would be a mistake to imagine that the Deuteronomic reform exhausted his expectation of his people's future, or grasped the deepest elements in his thought. His thought took a wider and profounder range, and had a far-reaching influence on the finest minds in Israel.

He grew up in Northern Israel, familiar with its history and its traditions. His mind is steeped in the stories of its great past. He lingers over names, as all men do to whom names bring up pictures: Gilgal, Shechem, Gibeah mean to him what Flodden or Bothwell Bridge means to a Scotsman. He loves the traditions which tell of the nation's past, and does not disdain to repeat the songs that were in the mouths of his fellow-countrymen when they came on pilgrimage to their national shrines and felt their unity in a common history and a common faith (see vi. 1–3, xii. 4 ff.). Not only is his mind stored with the memories of Israel's past, it is also at home in the spirit and temper of the record which had been written by E, the Northern historian, to preserve and interpret that past. His conceptions correspond with the great spiritual convictions which give its peculiar power to E's record. To him Jahveh is a free personality, who can reveal Himself where and how He will, and who, out of His grace, has revealed Himself to make Israel His own. His view of Jahveh as the giver of everything which has made Israel a nation, his view of Israel as the grateful recipient of its God's goodness, as needing no other protector and owning no other allegiance, are essen-

tially the convictions which lend a gracious and simple dignity to the early stories. He thinks of sacrifice as the means through which the people acknowledges the divine mercy, and gives constant expression to its humble and glad recognition of Jahveh's sufficient care. Because it embodies so great a thing, he is as much interested in it as E had been. For him the priesthood has in charge the task of declaring the divine will as to how men shall live together in the land of their God's gift. The nation is to him a nation because it belongs to Jahveh who made it. Since every part of its national life can express its allegiance and reveal its loyalty, no institution in Israel can be insignificant.

Such was the nation as Jahveh meant it to be, and as in the best minds of its own past it had conceived its purpose. Hosea has grown up in the atmosphere of these great ideals. And to him, in his manhood, came an experience which taught him with new vividness and depth what is involved in such a relation as is implied to exist between Israel and its God. He loved a woman, and, loving her, gave his name and his honour into her keeping. When he found that she had been false to him, he did not need to dissolve the relation between them. It was dissolved, for she had given her heart away from him.

In the light of what he has learned through his own pain, Hosea sees his nation as it is. He sees how it has fallen away from everything which made its past great or which could guarantee its future. He probes each form of the national life, and finds that all reveal the same radical failure. The kingdom, which was to have been ruled by the anointed of Jahveh, is equally impotent and base, because it serves no end save its own. The priesthood, through which men were to learn Jahveh's will in their perplexities, is a means by which the priests, who in their

own lives float any divine will, mislead a willingly misguided people. The life men live together in Palestine, in which they ought to have manifested their sense of the grace which sustains them all, has no mercy and no loyalty. The people, in everything which makes it a people, has departed from its God.

Jahveh was about to intervene, and, when He intervened, He did not need to bring to an end the old relation between Him and His people. It was at an end through the people's own act. Jahveh, when He intervenes, will simply lay bare what is true. He must withdraw all His gifts, the proof of His love, from the nation which has given its allegiance to another than Him. Israel shall be swept out of the land, without king or priest, sacrifice or law. It cannot dwell in its Lord's house while its heart is not His.

Both Amos and Hosea, in their view of the divine intervention, have the idea of necessity: Amos, the necessity of God's purpose in His moral character; Hosea, the necessity of God's love. It may be added that, because both prophets construe necessity as a moral necessity, they have no place in religion for a mere cosmic process. The intervention of Jahveh is the act of Him who, in His free personality, governs the world for His own ends. Jahveh, said Amos, must vindicate Himself, lest His purpose in the world come to nothing. Jahveh, said Hosea, must vindicate Himself, lest love itself be profaned.

Hosea, as thoroughly as Amos, is beyond a national religion, but he has reached his position by a very different road. Amos reached it through his conviction of God's presence with man as man. To him God and humanity were in too real a relation for a religion which expressed their relation to be reserved for one nation. The basis of man's moral life was his relation to God: religion must be as

universal as the relation. Hosea reached his conviction through his insight into the depth of the relation which is implied in all true religion. All Jahveh's gifts to Israel were the outcome of His love, and consequently implied more than a mere outward gift. Jahveh cared for Israel so greatly that He called it His bride, and set His honour and His name upon it. All the acts of Israel's religion were the evidence of a gratitude which exulted in the divine care and loyally responded to the divine love. As such, they implied a joyous self-surrender. Without self-surrender the acts in themselves were empty of all significance. Because he believed that all the forms of the national life revealed self-reliance rather than self-surrender, Hosea had condemned kingdom, priesthood and cult in Israel. They no longer expressed the loving confidence on the people's part that Jahveh, His care and His will, were sufficient. In reality, however, no nation, made up of diverse elements and gathering into itself varied traditions, can ever exercise such self-surrender as to the prophet constitutes the essence of true religion. Only the individual, and the society constituted on the basis of acceptance of such a relation, the Church, can fulfil so great a function.

It is frequently said that Hosea discovered the individual. If the statement is interpreted to mean that there was before his time no individual piety in Israel, and that the nation was conceived as the unit in religion, what has already been stated of the JE stories (see p. 24, *supra*) is conclusively against it. Hosea drew his own personal religion from the relation which these stories express as existing between the Israelite and his God. To him also Jahveh is Israel's sufficient helper: to him Jahveh claims every Israelite's undivided allegiance. But the prophet, through his personal experience, has so learned the depth of this relation, has realised it as so intimate and powerful a factor in all parts of human life, has

recognised it to be possessed of so tender and searching a power, that no forms of the national life can adequately express it. Hence it is no accident that he has no promise of the Messianic King; and the absence of such an expectation has a far deeper cause than any view which he held of the kingdom. His view of religion was of a nature which made it impossible that it could be embodied in terms of the national life at all.

The true successors of the deeper thought of Hosea were not the Deuteronomists. They were, as we shall see, strongly influenced by the prophet; but their failure to break with the remnants of heathen thought was due to their failure to grasp all that was implied in his convictions. The true successors of the Hoseanic thought were Isaiah in his doctrine of the remnant and Jeremiah in his expectation of a new covenant. Both of these prophets recognised that religion was so great and so deep that it could only be cramped and misunderstood when men sought to pour it into forms borrowed from the national life, which carried with them not only the inevitable suggestions from man's relations in outward society, but the corrupting power on religion of these associations. Man must give himself to God, satisfied to serve His will alone, finding his freedom and his joy in his complete surrender. No less a reality than the glad acceptance of such a divine service must form the bond of their new society.

Because Hosea saw that the relation between Israel and Jahveh was already dissolved through the people's act, He declared that, when Jahveh intervened, the result must be to cast Israel out of the land and to take away the privileges which came from its God's love. Yet this could not be the end. In the tragedy of his own home, he had found that this could not be the end for him: and what God gave him grace to do, God would not fail to do Himself. He had been

unable to leave the woman who had once borne his name, and he had been unable to do that because the burden of the Lord was upon him. His God gave him grace enough to stoop and seek again the wife who had betrayed him, to transmute the misery and shame of his private life into a sacrament of love. It was his burden now to believe and declare that Jahveh's love was no less wonderful and rich. Jahveh, who had stooped to make the life of Israel His own, would stoop again to renew the relation which the people had broken. Beyond the divine intervention, with the overthrow of all the national life which resulted from it, he saw God bring forth a new thing.

VII.

What was Hosea's view as to the future of his people? He believed, like Amos, that Jahveh was about to intervene in the order of the world. He believed that the issue of the day of the Lord was a moral one; and as he looked round on the state of the nation to which he belonged, he sadly acknowledged that there was nothing which could endure this sudden and awful glory. Israel must fall, because there was no truth nor mercy nor knowledge of God in the land.

The fate which was to befall the people was irreversible and imminent. Hosea has been sent to announce, not to avert it. No repentance on the part of the people could turn it back—at least Hosea did not ask for repentance on the ground that by this means the fate which was immediately pending could be turned back. The penalty was irreversible; such repentance as men could offer and were wont to offer was null.[33] They had not the knowledge of God's purpose with them which could make their repentance fruitful; and Jahveh was about to intervene in order to

make clear to a careless generation what His eternal purpose was. Only after that could their repentance be of any avail.

The overthrow was so imminent that Hosea, in his agony over his nation's fate, could only pray that it might be quickly past: 'Hither with thy plagues, O death, and thy destruction, O Sheol' (xiii. 14).[34] Beyond this prayer there was only one other petition the prophet could urge. Since the desolation was so near and so dire, there was one last grace which Jahveh could grant them and all who loved them—that their children on whom it was to fall might be few. 'Give them, O Jahveh: what wilt Thou give them? give them a miscarrying womb and dry breasts' (ix. 14). He besought God for this last mercy.

Yet even here, where Hosea had declared that 'though they bring up their children, yet will I bereave them, that there be not a man left' (ix. 12), he added at the conclusion how the outcome of their God having cast them away should be that 'they shall be wanderers among the nations' (ix. 17). That is to say, the destruction cannot be complete. The doom pronounced is the same as that which is uttered over them in xii. 10: Jahveh shall reduce them to the condition of the nomads, a folk without king or land or cult (cf. iii. 4). And when one notes how ch. ix. begins with the declaration that they are to be cast out of the Lord's land, one must recognise that Hosea is declaring that Jahveh was about to revert to the beginning, when He made them a people. The trial He made of them has failed: in the land which was His gift, where He gave them a law, prophets, priests, a kingdom, they have failed to serve Him. He will bring His hand over them, and restore them after fearful suffering to their first condition.

It has frequently been urged that, if Hosea foresaw and predicted a happier future for the people, he turned the edge

of all his threats. The contention is only just, if the prophet did not mean to declare a real judgment. But it is a real judgment which he pronounced, and one which was irreversible: so awful were its penalties that Hosea prayed there might be few children to suffer from it. Any better future was to come only after the judgment had run its course; before the better future could dawn, Jahveh must intervene in a great act of self-manifestation which meant ruin for His people. Neither Amos nor Hosea preaches repentance in the sense of asking for a change on the part of the people which may avail to avert the calamity. Both of them come to predict the calamity, but both of them predict it as something which comes from Jahveh directly, and which implies a manifestation of what He is. Hosea believes that the earlier manifestation of Jahveh has revealed His unmerited love to Israel. What, therefore, is left to the people in the great day when Jahveh rises up to vindicate Himself in the world? Nothing, except what created them as a nation at the beginning—the wondrous mercy of God. But that *was* left.

Hosea has no doctrine of the remnant in Israel which is to survive the divine wrath. He does not, like Amos, represent the few who remain as the negligible survivors; nor does he, like Isaiah, speak of the survivors as those who, having faith, have all the promise of the future. That is because he approaches the question from a wholly different standpoint. To him religion consists, not in anything which man has done or can do, but in something which God has done, in which man finds his certainty as to what God will always do. Hence he is continually dwelling on how God's act in interfering for the people's sake implies more than a mere isolated act, since it implies something of an eternal character on God's side. God has, as it were, committed

Himself in His deed: He cannot leave it and go on to do something else.[35]

Hosea believed that once already Jahveh had intervened in the world-order, and that His intervention had resulted in the creation of the nation of Israel. Once the eternal order had made itself apparent in the sphere of this world and under the conditions of time, in the great deed by which Jahveh called Israel into being. Therefore, in the simple and wondrous processes of Israel's history, in the slow, quiet means by which a nation grew, in the institutions which helped its growth, in the pieties and reverence which gathered round its sacrifices and its homes, there was something of eternal significance. Love, unmerited and free, prompted Jahveh to build up this little people and to value its simple response to His loving-kindness. Now the end of God's work is one, though its methods may change.

Because Israel's chastisement was to come, not from Assyria, but from the hands of God, its meaning was not exhausted in the ruin which it brought. God was dealing with His people, and because it was God who was dealing with a people whom He created and to whom He gave His name, it could learn from this act on His part. In ch. xi. Hosea develops how Jahveh tried kindness with Israel, and how He has resolved to change His method: His compassion is turned to anger (ver. 8). But He has not changed His nature: He has only changed His method.[36]

Hence the punishment which fell and was still to fall upon them had a pedagogic purpose. When they learned how Assyria could not heal their wound (v. 13), they should discover the inevitable result of seeking help from any other than Jahveh. When the impotence of the king they made not by Jahveh (xiii. 10, vii. 1–7) was patent to everybody (x. 3), they should discover the fruitlessness of their own

counsels. When the calf of Samaria which was the work of their own hands was carried away as a present to the great king, they should be bitterly ashamed of their devices (x. 6). When they were cast off out of their land, they should learn how it was Jahveh, not the baalim, to whom they owed the land originally (ii. 5). The punishment was all the outcome of a love which in itself was unalterable.[37]

Once Hosea believed that, at the divine prompting, he could not put away from him all anxiety as to his wife, though she had been unfaithful to him: 'Jahveh said unto me, Go, love again a woman who loveth another' (iii. 1). The emphasis lies on 'love again.' He proceeds to describe how he could not take her back into their old mutual relations, but must live with her as though they were no longer husband and wife. The measures which his love prompted him to take are comparatively unimportant; what is important is that he must take some attitude toward her which expresses his unchanging affection. The measures too must vary according to the woman's attitude. But the significant thing was that, so far as he was concerned, his relation to her could not be broken off even by her unfaithfulness. This woman, who had borne his name, could never be to him like any other woman. She had borne his name before the world; she had borne him a child. Her misery appealed to him, as the misery of another woman could not. Her shame was in some measure his shame. And so God's anger could not exhaust the divine purpose with Israel, for the relation between them was based on God's love. There could be a new beginning, for what made the first beginning was still there. And Hosea saw it to be possible that his countrymen—landless, kingless wanderers among the nations; having nothing but words to offer to their God—might bring their words, and might offer Him the only thing which was left them, the fruit of their lips. And He,

who desired mercy and not sacrifice, the knowledge of Him more than burnt-offering, would give them a future, even as He had given them their past. Jahveh, who had all power, was about to assert His rule in the world by an intervention in all human things. But Hosea had learned how power over a wife was governed by moral considerations; and he believed that power over a world also must be governed alike in its ultimate ends and in the means it employs to gain its ends by spiritual considerations, and the most enduring of these was love.

If, therefore, the people can learn from its discipline, and cast away its reliance on the foreign powers, on its own strength, and on its false worship (xiv. 4), Jahveh will be to it all that He has been in the past (xiv. 5 ff.).[38] The wilderness, into which God has led Israel, and in which it has renewed its dependence for everything on Him, shall become what it was before, the door into a great future (ii. 16–18). When men have learned to look to God for all they need, they shall find the meaning of His discipline and the sufficiency of His blessing (xiv. 9).[39] It is in Jahveh that Israel's life is found: when Israel knows this, He who has afflicted it will make the people blessed.

But Hosea's expectation for the future contains more than the mere statement that Israel is to renew its life in Palestine with a quickened sense of dependence for all things upon its God. As he predicted an intervention of Jahveh in the world-order, he believes that, after it has come to pass, there shall be a new earth, made new by the presence of its God. Jahveh shall make a new covenant, not with Israel, but on behalf of Israel with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground (ii. 18). Now, so far-reaching a promise, as will be pointed out later in Isaiah (p. 185, *infra*), has larger suggestions as to the thought

of the prophets. What we would insist upon here is that Hosea is expecting, as the outcome of the divine intervention, a change in the constitution of the world; for a covenant between reconciled Israel and the beasts can only come about through a change, not merely in the character of Israel, but in the nature of the beasts. The wild creatures shall cease to molest a people which is living in the world where God has made all things new. That the prophet is thinking of a new world is equally evident in the second half of the verse, where the promise is given that Jahveh will 'break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the land, and will make them (Israel) to lie down safely.' Here it is frequently thought that Hosea expects no more than peace for the land of Israel, in order that the people may dwell quietly. But how is that peace to be brought about? If Hosea expected that Israel was to dwell among the heathen, then, as Gressmann points out,[40] it is an extraordinary view of the future Utopia to prophesy peace for Israel, when all the weapons of war are removed out of its land and the people is left defenceless against its enemies. Either we must translate *haaretz* as the earth, and conclude that Hosea anticipated the removal of all warlike weapons, or, translating *haaretz* as the land of Palestine, we must suppose that Hosea looked for a day when the heathen powers should cease altogether, and when the disappearance of the weapons from Israel's land would mean the same thing as the disappearance of them from the whole earth. Then his prediction of the disappearance of sword and bow and battle meant that brotherly love should so govern all the conduct of Jahveh's people that the weapons of strife would disappear. In either case, we must recognise that here also Hosea is foreseeing something which concerns, not Palestine alone, but the world; and that he foretells, in the

day of the consummation, the emergence of a new order not merely between men but between beasts and men.

But the new order is to stand upon the earth, which becomes the earth of the redemption. And, because this is so, the earth shall offer its best to those who shall belong to this new order (ii. 23 ff., xiv. 7 f.). A renewed earth and a reconciled humanity are the full expectation of the prophet. Mankind was to take all these things as a gift out of the hand of God, to use them in His presence and with the sense that they could serve Him thereby. Mankind becomes the high-priest of nature, using its gifts fully and joyfully, and thereby offering them to God. It is easy to see how such an expectation gave rise to the somewhat sensuous expectation of a later day. Israel of a later date became more conscious of the flesh, so that it looked for the full Kingdom of Jahveh as something which could only be realised apart from the flesh: thereupon the despised flesh took its revenge by turning into sensuousness the great hopes of the early prophets. Hosea was not suspicious of the flesh or of the rich earth with its gifts. These were God's gifts. And God's kingdom, when it came to fruition, would come on earth, and would bring with it corn and wine and oil. Flesh and blood were holy, and were recognised as such, for a prophet looked that God's kingdom in the consummation would be on earth. Yet he knew it could not be on this earth, where man and beast lived in constant antipathy, where earth gave nothing without pain: it must be on a renewed earth, the earth of the redemption, where love held complete sway.

CHAPTER VI

ISAIAH.

I.

In the year that King Uzziah died, the greatest prophet of the Old Testament saw the Lord, and, seeing Him, saw also his own life-work as a messenger to his nation of the nature and will of Him who thus intervened to make His purpose in Israel known.

He whom Isaiah saw was the Holy One, high and lifted up. Before Him the seraphim veiled their faces, and the fulness of the whole earth was His glory; yet He sat throned in the temple of Jerusalem, and He chose a man to be the messenger to Israel of that which He was about to do. The combination is characteristic of the prophet's whole attitude. No other has so deep a sense of the unique majesty of God and of the creaturely vanity of man: 'Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help, and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are very strong: but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord! Yet He also is wise, and will bring evil, and will not call back His words' (xxxi. 1 f.). Such a sentence proves how to its writer Jahveh is outside the old categories and belongs to a special sphere, not merely as a power in the world which must be reckoned with, but as the Power who is behind all and who by His word dominates all.

Whenever Isaiah speaks of the objects of men's worship, it is enough for him to say that they are the work of men's hands (ii. 8, 20), and so partake of the character of those who made them. He is fond of a word which describes the pettiness of the things men worship; they are *elilim* (אֱלִילִים), at once godlings and nothing.

But, when Isaiah speaks of God as holy, he does not at first go beyond a conception which is common to the Hebrew faith and to the faith of their neighbours.[1] Amos represented Jahveh as swearing by His holiness (iv. 2) and as swearing by Himself (vi. 8), and so showed that to him the divine holiness meant the divine essence. God, so far as He is holy, is separated in everything which makes Him God from man in his fugitive and creaturely existence, so that the word included every characteristic of the Godhead which distinctively belonged to Him.[2] It is a mistake to suppose that the divine holiness was, at this stage of the religious thought of Israel, reserved for the peculiarly ethical quality which the word now bears; but it is an equal mistake to forget that the phrase was used with a sufficiently wide connotation to include this as well as every other quality which is divine. The sense of the word in its general use was wide enough to include all the attributes which are assigned to the Godhead; its peculiar significance to each prophet must be determined by the divine characteristics on which he laid stress as of special importance.

When, therefore, Isaiah spoke of God as holy, he used a phrase which was familiar and which carried a broad general sense. But, whenever Isaiah speaks of the God of his own adoration, he uses a phrase which he was the first to employ in Israel: he calls Jahveh the Holy One of Israel. He, of whose transcendent majesty the prophet speaks so greatly and so often, whom men call holy when they think of His

majesty, not only holds a relation to all the world, but has entered into a peculiar relation to Israel. He sat throned in the temple and protected Zion. Because of this peculiar relation Isaiah has something to say, for Jahveh made him a prophet to speak to this people, which belonged to Jahveh.

There is only one purpose the presence of which gives reality and meaning to the universe: the fulness of the whole earth is Jahveh's glory. Yet God's purpose is not fully revealed in the world, but is free and, as such, has intervened, and can intervene again, whenever God will. That the idea of Jahveh's will as free and self-revealing is fundamental to the thought of Isaiah is evident, because it was this which made him a prophet. Jahveh came to him to change the whole current of his life, and, by changing the current of his life, to make him a messenger of the intervention of Jahveh in the people's life. When the prophet speaks at the moment of his call of how he dwells among his own people, and in accepting the divine commission accepts it as a commission to speak to his own people, he expresses his sense of how the intervention of Jahveh is for the sake of Israel first and is made known to Israel. The Holy One of Israel, who once intervened in the world to call this nation into a peculiar relation to Himself, is about to intervene again; and, before He does so, He makes known through a prophet what He is about to do. The will of Jahveh is not merely manifested in the order of the world, of which man is a reverent spectator; it is free, and reveals itself directly to a man.

The leading characteristic of the divine intervention, and so of the purpose which commands it, is ethical. The proof of this is to be found in the reaction which the divine revelation produced in the prophet. He cried at the sight of God, 'I am a man of unclean lips and I dwell among a

people of unclean lips, and mine eyes have seen the Lord.' Here it is necessary to remember that "in Hebrew idiom a man's words include his purposes on the one hand, his actions on the other, and thus impurity of lips means inconsistency of purpose and action with the standard of the divine holiness."[3] When Isaiah declares himself and his nation to be of unclean lips, he means that because of their uncleanness they are unfit to bear the close presence of their God; but when he gives this reason for his being undone, he shows how far he is removed from the earlier naïve idea which expected the death of a mortal from the vision of God. The reason lies in his moral unfitness. What makes the prophet's meaning the clearer is that Isaiah, as has been pointed out, is elsewhere so conscious of the gulf which separates man in his creatureliness from God in His majesty. Yet the divine majesty is not the deepest thing in his thought of God, for, when he realised how God had deigned to speak to him, it was not his community in mortal weakness, but his share in human sin, which appalled him. The title 'holy' left it open to each prophet to attach to the divine nature what seemed to him of chief significance: this was of chief significance to Isaiah.

The ultimate purpose of the divine intervention is redemptive. No sooner has the prophet uttered the cry in which he confessed his unworthiness than he received the divine restoration, and received it without the use of any machinery save the simplest. It is not wise to press too far the fact that the means of atonement came from off the altar; but it is necessary to note that, when Isaiah finds his reconciliation through the glowing stone from off the altar, the place given to the altar, along with his seeing his vision within the temple, goes to show that the sacrificial system had been a real factor in his religious life, and could

not be thrust aside by him as useless in the life of other men. Some one has said that Isaiah made the act and the means of his forgiveness very easy, with the underlying suggestion that the prophet made it much too easy. To Isaiah redemption was easy because it was the outcome of God's intervention in human life, and so had, behind it all, the divine purpose. When God came to mankind, it was finally to heal and to create a new thing. Jahveh is about to reveal Himself in the life of His nation, and in order to do this, He makes use, as He has always done, of a prophet. But now for the first time the prophet acknowledged himself a part of that life which was unfit to endure the self-revelation of God, and was himself reconciled before he undertook to speak for God. The note which was struck there was novel and far-reaching. There was nothing which corresponded with it on the part of any among Isaiah's predecessors. Elijah counted it his melancholy pride that he was alone in the testimony he bore for Jahveh, and that he alone in all Israel had been faithful. 'The Lord appeared unto me,' said Amos, 'and said unto me, Go, prophesy against My people Israel':[4] and so it was Jahveh and Amos over against a disobedient nation. The prophet and people were not one in the need of a common mercy. The means through which Hosea's revelation of God's love came set him apart from the people, not a sharer in its unfaithfulness, but a judge of its faithlessness in the light of that which he had suffered, a preacher of God's mercy in the knowledge of a mercy he could not himself refuse. But Isaiah had identified himself with his own people in a common inability to bear the close presence of Jahveh, and, owning himself to be a sharer in their guilt, he had received reconciliation. Thereafter, he who was himself received back to the divine favour was commissioned as the messenger of God's purpose to the

people, so that his right to speak in the name of Jahveh rested on the truth that God had redeemed him. He knew, as the ultimate basis of his own religious life, that the final purpose of the divine intervention in human life was redemptive; and what was at the foundation of his own experience of God's will to him coloured all he had to say as to God's will for any man.

These great truths, which are found in vi. 1–8, and from which verses 9–13 must be separated,[5] make up the sum of Isaiah's message to his nation: he has offered himself, and has been accepted as the messenger in the name of Jahveh. His first commission is fulfilled in the conviction that he goes out in the name and at the bidding of God, who is about to manifest Himself in the world, and who has made known, through His self-manifestation to His servant, the purpose of that which He is about to do. But Isaiah's sense of how Jahveh is free and self-revealing, and of how His will is ever making itself realised afresh in the order of the world, made it impossible that he should go out with one specific message which could be summed up in so many words.[6] There is no final message to one who is the messenger of a self-revealing God, and who has but newly lived through an experience by which the divine self-revelation has changed his whole life. Isaiah is commissioned to interpret Jahveh's dealings with His nation in the light of that knowledge of the divine character and will which has come to him through Jahveh's dealings with him. But the truths he has received are so great that they must be reconciled in themselves, and their application to the nation's life must be interpreted from year to year. Isaiah accepted the task, as God's prophet, to seek, in the best way he might, to fulfil this mission.

II.

His first impression, as he faced his life-work, was that of the hopelessness of the thing which he had been called to do. This is the meaning of vers. 9–13, from which the last clause of ver. 13 must be omitted.[7] He knew the work to be urgent, since it was one to which God had commissioned him, and since it was one which the people greatly needed; but he felt how hopeless it was that he should succeed in it. 'Go and tell this people, hear ye indeed but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn again, and be healed.' That is not the final message which any prophet could bear to his generation, since it cuts away the roots for any real utterance. It might be interpreted as the fragmentary beginning of a longer speech in which the prophet called for repentance, and used this method of drawing the attention of his hearers. But, since the words are not associated with any further speech, and are definitely brought into connection with the prophet's call, such an explanation is not satisfactory. The verses represent the cry of a young man, who came after Amos and Hosea, who saw that outwardly at least they had failed, and who could not anticipate anything but a like failure for any words which he might utter.[8] The effect of the messages of his predecessors had been to make the condition of the men to whom they spoke worse, since after the prophets had spoken those who heard them sinned against the light. Isaiah had no right to expect a better result from his efforts, and he felt at the beginning as though he were commissioned to fight a hopeless battle. What could he do, what could he say, more than had already been done and

said to his people? The outcome of all his work must be what had been the outcome of their work—to make men worse instead of better, through making their sin more deliberate and conscious.

What makes this clearer is that the prophet's earliest utterances move so plainly along the lines which had been laid down by Amos. Before Isaiah came to himself he said, in the few oracles which have been rescued from his first period, practically the same things which Amos had said. Thus he began his ministry to united Israel.[9] In so early a speech as ii. 6–22 he addressed himself to the house of Jacob, which corresponds to the whole family that Jahveh brought up out of Egypt (Amos iii. 1). The nation to both prophets was one in its origin and in its guilt. But more definitely, in the parable of the vineyard, Isaiah described the house of Israel as the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts,[10] the men of Judah as the plant of His delight (v. 7). The whole nation is included within the mercy and the judgment of its God.

The recognition of having a message to the united people does not, however, imply that the early judgments were not peculiarly directed against Northern Israel. In this respect also Isaiah closely followed his predecessor. Amos spoke to the whole family which came up out of Egypt, but turned his attention practically to Northern Israel. Isaiah said, 'The Lord sent a word against Jacob, and it hath lighted on Israel' (ix. 7); the purpose of Jahveh's word was wider than the place of its first activity, but the storm centre was Samaria, which even to the prophet of Judah was still the centre of gravity of the people.

But the scope of the divine intervention in judgment is not confined to Israel. When Jahveh arises, it is to shake terribly the earth (ii. 21); the day of the Lord, when it

arrives, is to involve the humiliation of everything which is high and lifted up; and among the lofty things which shall be brought low are included not merely the works of man which have revealed and increased human pride, but the oaks of Bashan, the cedars of Lebanon and all lofty mountains (ii. 12–17). Since the lofty mountains are joined to the oaks and cedars, it is clear that we are here in a region of thought which excludes the idea that the oaks and cedars are to be cast down, because they have ministered to Israel's pride through being built into palaces and long ships. The day of the divine self-revelation which can produce such results cannot be directed only against Israel, nor can it be carried out by any conqueror.[11] Isaiah is still moving in Amos' thought of the world-catastrophe.

Hence in all these early oracles, except v. 25–30,[12] there is no mention of the instrument by which Jahveh is to bring about His judgment.[13] In the parable of the vineyard (v. 1–7) and in the oracle as to the day of the Lord (ii. 6–22) both the nature of the judgment and the instrument by which it is to be effected are left as vague as they were left by Isaiah's predecessor.

Hence, too, the outcome of the divine judgment is to be a mere negligible remnant. When the ruin of Northern Israel had taken place, all that should remain of the kingdom was to be like the leavings which men do not take the trouble to gather when the harvest is complete (xvii. 6).[14] What makes this more significant is that it disagrees so fundamentally with Isaiah's later conception of the remnant. The remnant here does not consist of the few marked out for salvation by their attitude to Jahveh, but is, as in Amos iii. 12, the two legs and piece of an ear which the shepherd does not stoop to pick up.

The young prophet has not yet come to himself. He

has taken over from his predecessor the older conception of the day of the Lord as a world-judgment. It represents to him the general overturn of all the settled order of things when Jahveh manifests Himself to shake terribly the earth. Isaiah has come forward to take up the work and the word of Amos,[15] but already he has taken up both with a difference. There is a restraint in the use of the language which describes the divine theophany, and there is an omission of older methods of describing it,—alike in its appearance and its results,—which prove that the prophet is farther away from the cosmological conception of the judgment. The older element is present, but still farther in the background than it was in the earlier prophet. Already the effect of his early vision with its strong ethical content has made Isaiah instinctively turn from certain elements in the older thought of the world-judgment. He has his own message of the character and the will of Jahveh who is intervening in men's lives, because he has his own experience of that which Jahveh has done for him.

III.

In 743 the kings of Northern Israel and Syria entered into a league for mutual defence against Assyria, and sought to coerce Ahaz of Judah into joining the coalition.

From this period Isaiah had nothing more to say to Northern Israel; it had leagued itself with the foreigner, and should share his fate. He added to his original oracle, in which he had denounced woe on Samaria, v. 27–30. Israel, which has cast in its lot with heathenism, shall fall before the enemy which it has so greatly dreaded that it forsook its trust in its divine helper in order to take refuge under the protection of Damascus. Damascus, in which it put its trust, shall be powerless to deliver itself. Israel trusted in the

heathen, and by the heathen it shall fall. Isaiah dismissed the Northern kingdom in these few words, and henceforth has nothing to say concerning it. But from this period Isaiah turned to Judah with his own message, which grew ever clearer to himself. He came down to meet Ahaz, leading by the hand his little son, Shear-jashub—a remnant shall return—and so he came, no longer like Amos with a message of denunciation, but with an offer of reconciliation in the foreground of his utterance.

Of recent years it has been erected almost into a dogma of criticism that Isaiah is merely the prophet of denunciation; it is impossible to read such a commentary as that of Marti without recognising that all the utterances of the prophet are construed in the light of the preconception that he can say no more. Wherever a hint of something more than judgment appears, it is counted sufficient to say that Isaiah has no such message to deliver, since he predicts nothing but catastrophe; and forthwith the offending phrase is cut out, to be flung into the scrap-heap of the exile.

But such a position makes it impossible to understand why Isaiah, in his first and most significant public appearance, went to meet Ahaz leading Shear-jashub by the hand. Neither the appearance of the child nor his importance in connection with his father's work can be excised. The child must be left there, but the theory which interprets vi. 9–13 as the summary of Isaiah's message, and sees in the verses rightly enough no prophecy of restoration, has no explanation to offer as to why the prophet called his son 'a remnant shall return,' or as to why he took a son with such a name to meet Ahaz. Far less can it show why his presence should be significant of the occasion. The boy is left with no connection either with the experience from which Isaiah's life-work as a prophet sprang or with the later mission of his father. Now

both the explanation and the origin of the name are to be found in the fundamental truth of Isaiah's own religious life and of his prophetic commission. He knew himself to be in a right relation to God, because he had received the divine forgiveness; he was conscious that he had something to say to his nation as to Jahveh's purposes with it, because his own commission rested on the divine mercy. No man who holds this truth as the source of his religious life and his religious work can be a mere prophet of denunciation. It may take a long time for so fruitful, because so simple, a verity as to the ultimate purpose of God to work its way into the whole of a man's thought about God and man; but it is too fundamental and too moving a reality to be anything other than active in all a man has to say.

Isaiah had given the boy his name before ever the Northern coalition had been formed. When, because a bond with the heathen practically implied apostasy, he dismissed Northern Israel from his hope as having thereby forsaken Jahveh, he came to Ahaz, not to denounce a catastrophe, but to plead that his own people of Judah might yet, before it was too late, set itself right with the God who was about to manifest Himself in the world. He came to plead as one who knew how possible and how life-giving it is to surrender to the divine direction. But withal he came with a boy whose name meant that a remnant shall return, because he knew how inward a thing the surrender is which conditions all forgiveness, and how little any man can predict who shall finally submit to that discipline.[16]

And this note of something more than denunciation, which Isaiah struck at the beginning when he took his own definite way, is always present. There is one consideration which deserves more weight than it has yet received —that Isaiah has persistently been accepted as the prophet

of hope. It is impossible to ignore that men in a later period added many glosses and even lengthy passages to the earlier prophets, and that, in particular, additions which promise a happy future to the nation have been inserted at the conclusion of some of the prophetic books. But if Isaiah is to be construed as a mere prophet of denunciation, and if every utterance which hints at the great future is to be excised from his writings, it is necessary, not to cut out a few passages from the conclusion of the separate books of which his prophecy is composed, but to remove sentences here and hints there. If all these are glosses, it is necessary to ask why they came to be scattered so liberally over the oracles of this particular prophet. It is necessary to seek an explanation why the great prophecy of the restoration in Deutero-Isaiah was added to his book as though that were its natural place. It is no longer enough to say that this was done in the exile. Even in the exile, men were guided by some reason and by some sense of fitness in the way in which they dealt with their holy writings. And it is the persistence with which prophecies of restoration have been added, if they were added, to Isaiah above all the earlier prophets, which demands an explanation.

If Isaiah foresaw only the destruction of Jerusalem, and so long and so often, so vehemently and so expressly, foretold no more than this, it is difficult to believe that men in the time of the exile, some hundred or hundred and fifty years after his death, were able to celebrate him as the representative of the opposite view. It is not difficult to conceive that they misinterpreted the spiritual conceptions which underlay the prophet's view of the future and which conditioned it all; it is even easy to understand how men who lived through the amazing and unexpected deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib made this a reason for vulgar-

ising the prophet's hopes for his city; but it is difficult to believe that they could turn the drift of all his utterances into the direct opposite of that for which he stood.

The deliverance of Jerusalem, so unlooked for and so signal, was calculated to drive out of men's minds the threats of destruction and to lead them to soften down some of the utterances of the earlier prophets as to the penalty which was to come on the guilty city. But that their natural inclination knew definite limits and could not go so far as to change the whole drift of a prophet's utterance is proved by the way in which Micah's prophecy was remembered. Micah had foretold (iii. 12) that Jerusalem should be ploughed as a field; and, even after the deliverance under Sennacherib, the oracle was living on in the minds of the citizens at the period of Jeremiah (xxvi. 17 ff.). It is just to ask why they remembered Micah's words with such exactness and with such an impression of awe, if Isaiah, living in the city, had spent his whole prophetic lifetime in uttering similar threats. They retained accurately the sense of that for which Micah had stood, and felt that he had come forward distinctly as a prophet of judgment. And the fact that they thus singled him out and passed over his mightier contemporary, can only be explained on the supposition that they were conscious of how Isaiah stood for something different.

What Isaiah foretold was different from the conception of the men of the exile. Judgment was as deeply embedded in his prophecies as in the utterances of Amos and Micah; but Isaiah stood for something more than bare judgment, and in their own way men recognised it. However much they failed to grasp the full scope of the 'something more,' and especially the significance of the terms on which it was promised, they recognised that Isaiah held an ampler sense of the divine purpose than others. He was emphatically the prophet of

hope. They had no hesitation about developing hints as to restoration which appeared in his oracles; and they felt it in no wise incongruous to add the great prophecy of the restoration from exile at the close of his book. So doing, they recognised that Isaiah stood for the amplitude of Jahveh's purpose as something which was not exhausted in judgment. And this was no accidental part of his message, but was rooted in his own religious experience and in the event which had made him a prophet at all. He must speak of Jahveh's intervention, however sharp its first effects might be, as having its ultimate issue in redemption because it had redeemed him. And therefore he came to his meeting with Ahaz, leading the boy who expressed in his name the prophet's conception of the final purpose of the God in whose name he spoke.

The situation of Judah was critical, since the little nation could not long offer resistance to such an enemy as now menaced her. Ahaz and his advisers saw no way out of their danger except by throwing themselves into the arms of Assyria, and meantime, before Assyria came to their relief, putting the capital into such a position of defence as would ward off the first attack of the allies. The scheme was neither foolish nor unpatriotic, and Ahaz, in forming it, was not the weakling he has so often been represented as being, any more than Ahab was the feeble fool who is frequently held up to derision. To say that, by casting himself into the arms of Assyria, Ahaz invited that nation to interfere in the politics of Western Asia is to ignore the fact that Assyria was interfering in those politics already, and that the reason for the Syro-Ephraimitic league having been formed was its interference. To say that, by his action, Ahaz furnished Assyria with an excuse for intervention at some later date in Judah is to forget that Assyria did not wait for any excuse

before it took what served its ends. The Northern powers, who formed their coalition before Assyria came, had a juster sense of the nature of their enemy, the ravenous ambition of which was not governed by little lawyer-like considerations as to whether it could find a plausible excuse for pushing its way to the Mediterranean. And when Ahaz is represented as being prepared to sell the independence of his country, of which Isaiah came forward as the vindicator, it is fair to remember that the king was in the situation in which he was compelled to choose between dependence on Damascus and dependence on Assyria, and that he may be excused for thinking that the more distant superior was likely to interfere less than Damascus and Ephraim with the peculiar customs and the religion of his people.

Probably the course which Ahaz followed was the wisest which could be planned in the circumstances, and certainly it was justified by its results. As a politician, Ahaz must be judged by his success, and he succeeded in preserving Judah during a singularly difficult period from the fate which befell Northern Israel. When the news of the fall of Samaria reached Jerusalem, Ahaz may justly have congratulated himself on having chosen the politic course he did choose, at the time when Samaria sought to coerce him into a policy which cost the Northern kingdom itself so dear.

With such considerations as these Isaiah's message to the king had nothing directly to do; it was not primarily a political, but a religious declaration he brought. In these great events which were happening, or about to happen, the prophet saw the evidence of the coming of a far greater event—that divine intervention in the world which it was his business to announce. He came with the greater urgency because he believed that Northern Israel was now doomed through the course which it had chosen, and he pressed his

message on Ahaz in the hope that his own people might yet be the remnant of salvation. In his view, the only enemy from whom any evil was to be feared by Judah was Jahveh,[17] who was about to reveal Himself, and the first duty of the nation, governors and governed alike, was to set themselves right with Him.

But Isaiah found the king, counsellors, and people with their minds preoccupied by the anxiety over the Northern coalition: 'their heart was moved, as the trees of the forest are moved with the wind' (vii. 2). Because of this consuming anxiety, nothing of all that it was the prophet's aim to press upon their attention could really reach their minds; and they would remain unable to listen so long as their preoccupation continued. Isaiah's first business was to remove this anxiety; and in the name of God he bade Ahaz know that there was nothing to be feared from the allies. Damascus and Samaria were 'two stumps of smoking firebrands' (vii. 4); the kingdoms were smouldering out, according to Jahveh's irreversible counsel. To this prediction there is no condition attached, either in its first statement or in its restatement in viii. 1–4,[18] and what makes its repetition in the latter passage more significant is that Isaiah confirmed his first prediction, even after Ahaz had refused to listen. The rescue of Judah from the danger which thus threatened was not dependent on their faith or their want of faith.

Yet it was not the mere certainty of the collapse of the hostile coalition which Isaiah announced. He announced it in order that the message might calm men's minds and leave them free to accept the greater truth which lay behind. What lay behind the bare fact was that Jahveh was He who thus protected His people, and through this event gave them the proof of how His hand controlled the destiny

of the nation. The event which was to deliver Judah was of His ordering. If men in Judah could see that, they would see so much more than the bare collapse of the league; for they would see the hand of Him who had brought it about, and by their trust in Him they would be established anew (vii. 9). But so long as they did not see that, they would see in the fall of the league no more than a casual incident in the world's history, which had no spiritual significance; and, turning back to their old attitude to Jahveh, they would be established on no surer foundation than before.

Therefore Isaiah urged Ahaz to ask for a sign (ver. 11)—*i.e.* to demand something which would be, even to him, the sufficient proof that Jahveh's hand was in all this business. Let him claim something which would be the incontestable proof that he was dealing with God, and that God was intervening to deliver Judah for a larger purpose of His own. The sign which Isaiah offered was not to be a sign that the prophecy as to the fall of Damascus and Ephraim was to come to reality. For that the only sure test was to wait until the predicted event came to pass. The sign was to be the guarantee that the event was coming to pass through Jahveh's intervention, and so was part of His wider purpose with Judah.[19]

IV.

Ahaz refused the prophet's request. Though his refusal in itself and in the reasons he gave for it has the appearance of great reverence, and though it is along the line of our thought as to the attitude men should take toward God, it is necessary to remember how apparently reverent acts may spring from an irreverent source. What kept Ahaz back was not his disbelief in Jahveh's power or will to give such

a sign, should it be necessary: his ideas on these matters were the same as those of Isaiah. What kept him back was his unwillingness to have the intervention of God proved at all. He was already in treaty with Assyria, and expected the defeat of the coalition through the alliance he hoped to make; and he had no taste for a sign which, making it evident that Jahveh did have a controlling hand in Judah's affairs, must involve a complete change in his entire policy.

Isaiah knew this: and, since to him the supreme concern was that Jahveh was intervening in the order of the world, since Jahveh meant to intervene whether Ahaz recognised the fact or not, he came forward with the promise of Immanuel, which was the sign.

There are two points in connection with the promise of Immanuel which are fundamental for its being rightly understood. The one is that the sign must have been of such a nature as to give the guarantee of how the events which were befalling Judah were no mere accidents, but were the outcome of Jahveh's intervention for His own ends. This was the character and this was the purpose of the sign which Isaiah urged Ahaz to request; and this was the reason why the king refused it—he wished to see no more than the hand of Assyria in his deliverance. The prophet's whole interest was gathered up in the one desire to convince his nation that they were in God's hands, and that their attitude to Him was their commanding concern. Ahaz revolted against the sign, because he instinctively felt that the conviction as to Jahveh's power being seen in the matter would play havoc with all his plans and method of government. But to Isaiah the king's unwillingness to recognise the divine intervention could not turn back what Jahveh was about to do. God was intervening, and was to give the sign of that transcendent fact.

The other point is that the character of the sign was inevitably changed in its relation to Ahaz and his court from the moment when he refused to welcome it and all that it implied. Had the rulers of Judah been able and willing to welcome the intervention of their God, they would have been set fast as a nation as they had never been before. But, since they wilfully shut their eyes to Him who was thus acting in their history, and since they were afraid to realise His impending intervention, God's intervention would produce the overthrow of all their schemes. Their indifference could not turn back Jahveh from doing that which He was about to do; Jahveh would still act as He had purposed to act. They had had the opportunity through the prophet to set themselves right with the great purpose which was about to realise itself in the world: they had been summoned to welcome it and to serve it. But, since they had refused to do this thing, Jahveh, when He came to do His own work, would need in the first place to overturn them and their counsel. Immanuel, 'God with us,' meant first, as Isaiah says in ch. vii., God against Ahaz and his court.

Jahveh, said Isaiah, was about to intervene in the world-history, and especially in the history of the nation which held a peculiar relation to Him. He was about to send the heavenly child, Immanuel. It is possible, though we cannot say it is more, that the prophet was referring to an expectation which was current in his time of the birth of a heavenly child, and that by 'the maiden' who was to be his mother he meant the maiden of whom all knew.[20] The expectation is often said to be borrowed from a Babylonian oracle or prophecy which was current in the Judæan world, but this is unproved and of itself very unlikely.

I offer no opinion on this view, except such an opinion as is within the right even of those who have no first-hand

knowledge of the Babylonian records. But it must be apparent that there has not as yet been offered any convincing proof of the existence of such an expectation in the Babylonian world. Yet what is needed to justify us in supposing that Isaiah made use of a story from a Babylonian source is more than the evidence that a few persons in Babylonia held an esoteric view as to the coming of a world-redeemer: we need an opinion so deeply rooted and so commonly held among a large circle that it could transplant itself and lay hold of minds in an alien race. It is not the casual opinions which have influenced a small circle that are generally able to spread from one nation to another. And to suppose that Isaiah had heard of such a hope cherished by a few in Babylonia, and that he used it among a people who had never even heard of it, is to conceive him as uttering something like a conundrum to those who listened to him.

Besides, I think we are learning to open our eyes to the fact that the world of Jewish thought was richer in its ideas and more varied in the colouring given to these ideas than it has hitherto been customary to recognise. The conceptions of Amos, a man of the people, speaking to the commons in terms they could understand, show the presence of elements in the early thought of Israel, which are the sufficient proof that the nation had appropriated and transformed, had even evolved, cosmological and theological theories of far-reaching suggestiveness. If, then, the idea is not due to Isaiah himself, the more likely supposition is that the expectation existed in Judah. But if Isaiah adopted, and did not create, the conception, he acted as Amos did when he took up the idea of the day of the Lord—*i.e.* he took it over because it could in some measure express his own thought; and he remade it, so that it might more adequately express his thought. He accepted it as the means by which he

could express that intervention of Jahveh in the affairs of this world, that emergence of Jahveh's purpose among the purposes of men, that breaking in of eternity on time which is a postulate of faith, and especially the postulate of a faith which, like that of the prophets, held fast the idea of a personal God, whose will is free and self-revealing. Isaiah took this because it expressed, more adequately than the phraseology of Amos could, his sense of how Jahveh, as a moral being, made use of moral agents for the realisation of His purposes on the earth. He has moved away from the day of the Lord with its thunder and shaking of the earth, and he has grasped how, to fulfil an end which is personal and ethical, personal and ethical means must be employed by his God.

God's purpose is not checked by the incapacity of Ahaz to welcome it, for God will find His own agent to fulfil His own ends. Because these ends are His own, because the court had the opportunity to set themselves right with them and have refused, the birth of Immanuel implies first a sifting within Judah itself. The remnant is not to be, as Isaiah once hoped and by his plea to Ahaz sought to bring about, the house of Judah after Ephraim had gone over to the enemy. The first thing Jahveh must do in order to make Judah the land of Immanuel must be to overthrow all for which the house of David now stands. In ch. vii. Isaiah pronounces doom on the court and their plans, and foretells how, through the disobedience of the court, the land over which they rule shall suffer in the invasion which is to take place.[21]

But Immanuel is the agent of Jahveh, whose intervention is at hand, and he fulfils the purpose of God—a purpose the character and content of which the prophet has learned. Because he is this, and because the revelation of Jahveh's

will brings with it more than a destruction of whatever is opposed to Him, the advent of Immanuel implies more than mere ruin to Ahaz and the State. His mission has a positive content, because He is sent by One whose glory is the fulness of the whole earth.

On this side of the meaning of the promised child Isaiah insisted in ch. viii.[22] He came before the people with his second son, Maher-shalal-hash-baz, 'spoil speedeth, prey hasteth,' some time after he had failed to convince Ahaz. He began his oracle by quietly waving Syria and Ephraim aside (ver. 4) as of no significance in connection with the fate of Judah at all. What alone was of significance was the action of Jahveh Himself and the attitude which men in Judah took to their God. What threatened the future of Jerusalem was not the existence of a party in the capital which was in favour of the coalition powers:[23] it was the sinful opposition to the rule of God in the world. The men of Judah, so far as their rulers are concerned, have refused the waters of Siloah that go softly—*i.e.* they have refused the peace of the divine protection.[24] The danger which threatened from the Northern coalition has brought to light a deeper, even a fundamental opposition: their fear before a passing peril has led them to grasp at any succour except the succour of Jahveh, and so has revealed their want of faith in His sufficient help. To chastise them, Jahveh is about to bring upon them the waters of the Assyrian deluge, which shall overflow all the land, covering it and rising up even to the neck—but no farther. It shall not be permitted to go farther, for the invader is being brought by Jahveh to serve His purpose, and His purpose is not satisfied by the destruction of Judah. The land over which the waters burst is Immanuel's: and therefore, though all the nations from the remotest parts of the earth were to gather themselves together against it, they can do no more

than what is permitted to them; and if they attempt to go beyond this, they shall be broken in pieces. Their mission, as their power, has been strictly limited by Him whose purpose they serve.[25] Already Isaiah had asked Ahaz to believe that it was not Rezin nor Pekah nor Tiglath Pileser who governed history, and had assured him of how behind all these was a mightier will. Now he said again that any of these powers, or all of them together, were but instruments in God's hands, and, if they were to lift themselves up to go a step beyond what Jahveh purposed, they should be brought to nought. Whoever could, instead of wavering in hesitating fear between these leagued powers, stay himself upon the God who controlled them all, would find in God his sufficient sanctuary.

This message of Isaiah was no longer intended for the court and the royal house, but for the men who were like-minded with the prophet. So far as Ahaz and the court were concerned, Isaiah had shot his bolt (in ch. vii.), and had no more to say than what he had already said. Jahveh has hidden His face from them (viii. 17). But all who could accept the prophet's message, had a message of hope sealed and secured to them (ver. 16). Isaiah and his children were signs and wonders to Judah. The boys expressed the two messages which were yet one: Shear-jashub, the message as it affected Ahaz; Maher-shalal-hash-baz, the message as it affected the followers of the prophet. The world was in the hands of God, who was about to manifest Himself anew there. To those who refused to accept and submit to God's will, the result could only be that the divine intervention would sweep them away; but such as were content that all things, themselves included, should be in God's hands, could wait with patience through a dark time when Jahveh was hidden from the rulers of the State, and could rest confident of a future

which Jahveh Himself should secure to them. Spoil speedeth, prey hasteth: but the men who rested their hopes on Jahveh were secure.

The situation became more definite after the collapse of the Northern league, because the policy of Ahaz seemed justified by circumstances, and the king was able to show more clearly his opinion of the prophet's counsel. Isaiah now surrendered all hope that Judah was to become the remnant of the return, and formulated more clearly his own hopes in ch. xxviii.[26]

The situation of the prophet at the court of Ahaz throughout his ministry, but more particularly at the period with which we have to deal, is much better understood when we dismiss from our minds the idea that he was of high social position, and able to make his way into the council-chamber of the king with a certain authority. He went out to meet Ahaz in a public place, as Amos went to confront Amaziah at the sanctuary of Bethel; and, like the Northern prophet, he represented the interests of the common people and found his principal support among them. Because he had some support from the commons, and because no one knew how great their support might be, Ahaz and the court were compelled to temporise and to treat him with a cautious deference so long as the danger from the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition was imminent and the help of Assyria was uncertain. But so soon as their plans were complete, and their alliance with Assyria made them able to ignore the enthusiast with his influence over the commonalty, they showed their real attitude towards him (vers. 8 ff.). As they boast in their new confidence, neither death nor Sheol can hurt them now, far less a prophet with his outworn saws of which they are heartily weary.

Isaiah began his oracle by stating that it had been his

task to pronounce doom on Samaria for its pride and sensuality, a doom which has been fearfully verified in its defeat at the hand of Assyria (vers. 1–4). He had hoped then that Judah, having learned from the catastrophe, might become the remnant (ver. 5) on whose behalf Jahveh would intervene, and whose future Jahveh would secure through men who, filled with the divine spirit, sought worthily to provide for the outward and inward needs of the State.[27] But the actual leaders of Judah were as bad as those of Samaria: they were worse, for they refused to go to school with the prophet and learn from the disaster which had befallen the sister State. The relief which had come to them through the fall of Samaria made them feel as though they had at last escaped from the prophet's school (ver. 10).[28] But Jahveh will send them to a harder school to learn the old lessons through their personal disaster: 'By men of strange lips and with another tongue will He speak to this people.' Assyria their deliverer shall be their master (ver. 13).

They counted themselves secure because of their alliance with Assyria; they had bargained with the destroyer, and were safe even against death and Sheol—no power could hurt them any more (ver. 15).[29] Isaiah returned to his persistent refrain. The danger to Judah did not come from Syria or Assyria, but from Jahveh. All their schemes were lies, because they ignored Him and His presence in the world.[30] "Rely on anything you please: rake earth and the under world to find guarantees for your security. Rest is only ordained for those who trust in Jahveh (ver. 16); for the others there is a consummation, and that determined." Jahveh is about to rise up to manifest Himself, and He shall not only break their covenant with Assyria, but shall use Assyria as the instrument of their chastisement. If they had had to do merely with Ephraim and Assyria, their clever

little arrangements might have sufficed to meet the situation. But they have to do with Him who orders both Ephraim and Assyria, and a league with Assyria is too small a thing to cover Judah in the great day, when Jahveh is rising up to deal with men. 'The bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it. For the Lord shall rise up' (ver. 20).

Again, however, Jahveh's intervention was too vast and far-reaching to be exhausted in the chastisement of the scornful rulers and the ruin of the sinful State. God's purpose has more than negative content; even while it swept away what seemed to them so secure, it must bring something. In Zion Jahveh was laying a foundation (ver. 16). Since Isaiah represented and thought of this as being laid, it must have meant to him something other than the old State with its relation between Jahveh and the people. Had Isaiah meant no more than the renewal of the old relation, he must have confirmed the rulers in their idea that everything would yet go well. But Jahveh was bringing about in Judah a new thing. Because it was new, it carried with it the dissolution of the old (vers. 17 f.). The fact which guaranteed the permanence of the new foundation —namely, that it was after the divine plan and was securely founded on Jahveh's will—made it certain that all who had rejected that will for the establishment of their State must be swept away. But, because this new thing was of Jahveh's ordering, and so served His eternal counsel, its own continuance was sure. Its future was as clearly determined as the consummation, since both rested on the same eternal cause. He who believeth shall not be ashamed.[31]

Isaiah has given up empirical Judah. The remnant on whom the future of the divine Kingdom rested, consisted

no longer of the people as a people, but of those who could stay themselves on Jahveh alone and who, after He had manifested His will in the world, would find a place of His ordering in the new condition He was to bring about.[32] The remnant, therefore, cannot be described as either an ideal thing or a real, because to Isaiah's mind it was both. It was already present in the men who were like-minded with the prophet and who accepted his teaching as to Jahveh's will: these were the lowly of God's people (xiv. 32) and the disciples, who received the sealed instruction of the prophet (viii. 16). Yet the remnant was also an ideal, the future of which none could measure, since Jahveh Himself would give it continuance and such outward success as pleased Him.

V.

In all this Isaiah was no calculating politician, who had a shrewder view than his contemporaries of the weakness of the Northern coalition and the permanent power of Assyria. To him the power of Assyria was a temporary thing. Assyria had a place in the divine purpose for the world, but its place was strictly limited. It had been ordained for judgment, but judgment was Jahveh's strange work (xxviii. 21). What was according to Jahveh's eternal nature, and must therefore finally come to pass, was something for which Assyria could only be a preparation. That Assyria had any place at all in the divine purpose was guaranteed to it merely through the work which it performed on Israel: but without its work on Israel it had in itself no place in the consummation of all things or in the final disclosure of the divine will; and therefore, when its work on Israel was completed, its support from Jahveh should cease. There must come a day when that for which Assyria was

ordained was completed, and then the nation, which in itself held no share in the divine counsel, must pass away.

Isaiah had been content in his earlier oracles (chs. vii., viii., xxviii.) to predict that the chastisement which must precede the consummation was coming through Assyria. But when Samaria had fallen, and when the power of the Eastern colossus was making even the hearts of the faithful faint with fear, he bade them recognise how Assyria also was in Jahveh's hand (ch. x. 24–34, 5–19).[33] The two oracles were delivered after the fall of Samaria (cf. ver. 11), when Assyria was already Judah's Northern neighbour. In the earlier (vers. 24–34) the prophet went straight to the matter which was causing men's hearts to tremble—namely, the ease with which Jerusalem could be attacked, now that all the buffer states had fallen. He described, as though it had actually taken place, the swift and unhindered march of the Assyrian armies along the backbone of the hill country (vers. 28–32).[34] The power which held Samaria was able, whenever it would, to shake its hand at the mount of the daughter of Zion. Over against this picture the prophet represents the equal ease with which Jahveh could overwhelm the invader: 'Behold, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, shall lop the boughs with terror: and the high ones of stature shall be hewn down, and the lofty shall be brought low. And He shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one' (vers. 33 f.).

Up till this time, Isaiah continued in a later oracle (x. 5–15),[35] Assyria's march had been unchecked (5–9), and it had brought down nations, not a few. The reason was that there was no strength nor endurance in the kingdoms which it attacked. So far as these nations were concerned, they were doomed to fall, since they had no place in the consummation (ver. 6), not even such a temporary place in

bringing about the consummation as was allotted to Assyria. Assyria, therefore, could find no resistance to its onward march in Carchemish or Calno; but Jerusalem stood in a different position. In Zion Jahveh was laying a foundation for His new order (xxviii. 16), and, so soon as Assyria came into contact with Zion, the conqueror reached the limit of his power.[36] Assyria, like Judah, was in God's hands. Though Assyria should come up over the whole land, it could only come to do the work which was appointed for it by Jahveh (xiv. 24–27). This work, so far as Judah was concerned, was to remove everything that went counter to the divine purpose: but, when Assyria had fulfilled this task, its power would be brought to an end by Him who used it for His purposes.

But Jahveh alone had the right and the power to set limitations to the instrument which He had summoned. He alone knew when its work was finished, and He must be free to determine the hour when He was to bring it to an end. He was using Assyria for His own ends, and, since its power came from Him, to resist it implied resistance to His will.

Only from this point of view is it possible to construe Isaiah's language as to the movement for liberty and the leagues to which the desire for liberty gave rise among the peoples of the West. When these attempts at freedom are judged from the political standpoint, it is not easy to see either their folly or their hopelessness. Northern Israel may have misjudged its ability, with or without the help of Damascus, to resist Assyria; but its failure to gauge the strength of the Eastern colossus ought not to lead anyone to close his heart against admiration for the gallant stand which, during three long years, Samaria made against the whole weight of the Assyrian empire. We are not sunk so low that we cannot give our admiration to men who in an

evil time staked everything and died for liberty—else the Greeks, who never forgot Thermopylæ, are our masters. And the further fact that the little capital, with all its allies beaten down, was able to make head for three years, is the sufficient proof that the leagues against Assyria which were so continually revived in Western Asia were not so inept as they have often been represented.

Isaiah is looking at the whole matter, as usual, from a point of view which is quite apart from the political. Judah, he said in xvii. 12–14, did not need to look for help: Jahveh intended to break Assyria, but at His own time and in His own way. To seek for another helper was to distrust the divine support. Again, in the year of King Ahaz's death, which coincided with a period of political weakness in Assyria,[37] ambassadors came from Philistia to invite the court at Jerusalem to join a league for freedom. Isaiah counselled that the messengers should be sent back empty-handed (xiv. 28–32); but his counsel had nothing to do with the political exigencies of the situation, and took no account of the duty of Judah remaining loyal to its suzerain power. Philistia, he said, was doomed; so far as the cities of the maritime coast were concerned, Assyria was irresistible, for these cities, like Carchemish and Calno, had no hold on anything which could guarantee them continuance against the rod of Jahveh's anger. So far as they were concerned, therefore, 'Out of the serpent's root shall come a basilisk.' But Zion was secure and needed no protector, because Jahveh had laid His foundation there; and whenever it pleased Him so to do, He would intervene for the deliverance of those who trusted in Him. 'The Lord hath founded Zion, and in her shall the afflicted of His people find refuge.'

The same attitude appears in the later oracle (ch. xx.),[38] which deals with the effort on the part of Ashdod to form a

league against Sargon. We do not know whether Hezekiah had shown any inclination to join the league; but, from the fact that Isaiah took the trouble to issue a formal warning to the people, it seems likely that either the court or the inhabitants had a hankering in this direction. All that we do know with certainty is that Hezekiah did not suffer chastisement from the Assyrians, and so, whether because of the warning of the prophet or because of other reasons, cannot have gone very far in allying himself with Ashdod. Isaiah, therefore, did not feel it necessary to say any more than that against adversaries such as formed the alliance Assyria was irresistible: Philistia must fall. Assyria had further and greater work from Jahveh to fulfil, and could not be prevented in its task by a people which had not even been commissioned for such limited work by God. Since, however, the attitude of Jerusalem and the court was different from what it had been in the time of Ahaz, Isaiah had no need to assure his people that their strength lay in Jahveh.

Still more instructive was Isaiah's message when an embassy arrived from beyond the rivers of Cush (xviii. 1–5).[39] Let them return, for Jahveh Himself will choose His own time to intervene against Assyria. The prophet had nothing to say about the fate which was to befall Cush or as to the practical issues of the league which was proposed. All he urged was that his people must not set its hand to do a work which was Jahveh's work and for which He must choose His own time. At present He was still, but, when He chose, not when the people pleased, He would lift up the signal for the nations to see. For Judah to take its fate into its own hands was to seek to force Jahveh to take action before His appointed time.

And when finally Hezekiah was tempted to take part in a

coalition with Egypt, Isaiah urged the same attitude (ch. xxxi.). But, though he spoke scornfully of Egypt as a feeble stay, it was not Egypt's weakness which prompted him to insist on his nation abstaining from the alliance; it was because the Egyptians were men and not God (ver. 3). To trust in them was to forget Jahveh, and the issue of seeking any helper other than Jahveh must be that, when Jahveh stretched forth His hand, both he that helpeth should fall and he that is holpen should stumble. To identify oneself with the heathen was to share their fate in the day of Jahveh's intervention. Jerusalem had no need to seek human help. What Isaiah contended against was every human alliance, for the Assyrian was to fall by the sword, not of man (ver. 8). Jahveh was about to intervene and break the instrument He had used for a time; but it was Jahveh who was to intervene, and who was to intervene at His own time and in His own way. When He did intervene, He would guarantee a place and a continuance to those who trusted in Him, and who proved their trust by the simple fact that they did not attempt to make a place for themselves.

Assyria's power over the world had a meaning. As the colossus overthrew one nation after another, it proved how each of them had no place in the eternal order.[40] As Judah groaned under the oppressor, Judah could learn how Assyria's power had a meaning for them also. It was the divine chastisement for their neglect of God's will. But, when Assyria's work was complete and the people had learned their lesson of repentance, Jahveh was to cease from this, His strange work. He shall show the lighting down of His arm, and through His voice shall the Assyrian be broken in pieces (xxx. 27–33). For endurance does not belong to Assyria, it belongs to those who have faith.

Isaiah took exactly the same attitude in the invasion

of Sennacherib. Only in one point did he go a little beyond the position which he had previously taken up. Himself convinced of the fact that the retreat of the Assyrian from before the walls of Jerusalem was the signal proof of how the world was in the hands of Jahveh, full of the sense of how the invader had been turned by the power of Him who had intervened to show forth His purposes, Isaiah hoped that the whole city might turn to their God and the remnant become identical with the nation he loved. The changed temper of the court under Hezekiah probably had something to do with quickening his new hope. But he confessed his bitter disappointment in xxii. 1–14. He saw how men in the hour of danger turned to think of their defences, and in the hour of their relief gave themselves up to feasting; he saw the joy at their deliverance become no reverent recognition of the will of the God who delivered them, but a vulgar debauch. And he said that their iniquity was bound upon their hearts, while they lived. But it is forcing the language of the prophet to say that in this he surrendered all hope of Judah and had now no expectation of even a remnant being found there. The cry was no more than the cry of a prophet who had hoped for more out of an outward event than any such event has ever been capable of bringing, and who said that the humanity for which he wrought was hopelessly frivolous, and that frivolity was bound on men's hearts till their death day, even when God was doing some of His mightiest works before their eyes.

In principle, however, Isaiah said there what he had always said. Assyria was Jahveh's instrument, to prove the emptiness of everything which had no hold on the divine purpose, and to chastise the nation which ought to have held fast by its God. But this task, and this task alone,

was what gave Assyria a place in a world where God was revealing Himself; and when its temporary task was done, Assyria itself could find no place in the consummation of all things. Only those found a place who could see God's hand in all human affairs and who could trust themselves to His leadership and protection.

Stärk (*Das Assyrische Weltreich*) thinks that the conviction as to the transitory character of Assyria and the permanence of Judah was not from the beginning in Isaiah's mind, but emerged through the prophet's experience of the real character of Assyria and Sennacherib. He believes that there was a double invasion of Judah by Sennacherib, and that the sight of the ruthlessness and faithlessness of the great king during the first invasion convinced Isaiah that Assyria could only endure for a time. I can see no need to base so large a change in the prophet's view on a reconstruction of the historical situation which, while it is plausible, remains always unproven. And, while my conviction—that the view of Assyria as an irresistible instrument in Jahveh's hands is not inconsistent with the view of Assyria as doomed to fall—is supported by my opinion as to the date for ch. xxviii., which is not shared by all nor likely to be accepted by all, it is not based upon any change in the date of certain chapters. Fundamentally it rests on the fact that Isaiah never thought of Assyria as anything else except an instrument for one specific task. When that task was completed, Assyria had no place in the consummation. Only those had a place in the consummation who had faith—a conviction which Isaiah uttered very early in his ministry. A nation like Assyria could not exercise the faith which to the prophet was an essential for endurance. Assyria could only imagine about itself that it was there to work its own will (x. 7, etc.); and this vain imagination on its part was the

sufficient proof of how it, equally with the court of Ahaz, had no abiding place in the Kingdom which Jahveh was bringing in. What alone had continuance was that which could serve the mighty will of God—*i.e.* a Judah on which Assyria had produced the result for which God used that nation, a Judah humbled and disciplined by the recognition of its God's irresistible purpose.

VI.

Again, in all this Isaiah came down on the empirical world of his own time with a teaching which was not the outcome of his view as to the political situation in which Judah stood among the world-forces of the day. Jahveh had a Kingdom which He was about to establish in the world by a transcendent act of self-manifestation. Isaiah, in the hope that Judah might as a nation hold its place in the new creation, urged Ahaz and his court to think of this first, and to set their kingdom right with the purpose of the God in whose name he spoke. He offered them a sign of how Jahveh was behind the forces of the world and controlled them all. When the court refused to think of such things at all, and gave their whole attention to escape from the difficulties of their present situation, Isaiah bade them know that their neglect could not hinder the divine Kingdom. Only now it must come in spite of them; and finding them in its way, must sweep them aside. Assyria, in which they trusted for escape from their perplexities, was to be the means of casting down their pride. But the Kingdom of Jahveh was of too great and positive a content to be brought about by Assyria, even as it was too sure a thing to be frustrated in its advent by Ahaz's refusal. It was to come through the means of One whom Jahveh was to raise up for

its realisation, and it was to come to the lowly in the land, who could welcome it and wait for it.

Since Jahveh's self-revelation had always a positive content, it could not be exhausted in the destroying work of Assyria, or even in bringing the instrument of chastisement to an end when its work was done. It must manifest itself in blessedness for those who have through all clung to faith in their God. Isaiah turned to those who shared his convictions, and in the two Messianic prophecies of chs. ix. and xi. told them the nature of the new thing which Jahveh was about to bring in.[41] The teaching in the chapters was fundamental to Isaiah's conception of the divine nature, for to him Jahveh's purpose was no mere reaction against the sin of man. Jahveh, whose glory is the fulness of the whole earth, and who brings about a new thing whenever He manifests Himself, had brought about a new thing in the prophet whom He chose. The content of the chapters was also in close agreement with his conception of the methods of the divine government. Jahveh, whose purpose was ethical, used no longer the outward forces of nature to bring His will to pass, but did His work through men. Assyria was His instrument for chastisement, and the divine child was His means for guiding His own. The institutions of men, and especially of Israel, had a new value, for Jahveh could use them for His ends. He could appear to Isaiah in the temple; and His new state was to be constituted afresh through good men, who knew the purpose which they gladly served (i. 26 f.).

The prophet saw that what stood in the way of the higher thing he hoped for his people was not merely Ahaz as an individual, or the court which Ahaz had gathered round him; it was the whole conception of all for which Judah stood in the world, which embodied itself in the attitude and temper of its rulers. The worldly kingdom with

its worldly aims was perverting Judah, so that the nation could neither see nor welcome Jahveh's purpose with them and through them. Therefore the kingdom, with all it represented, must pass away. The deliverer could not come to Judah, as Judah was. Only after Judah has learned through sore discipline, which has humbled men's pride,[42] can the great future dawn. The new scion shall spring only from the stump of Jesse (xi. 1). The old kingdom must go to make room for the new thing which Jahveh is bringing to pass.

But, when room has been made for the new thing, a new thing there shall be. A King, who has been sent by Jahveh, shall reign in Judah:[43] the new Kingdom which is to be set up is the emergence of eternity in the sphere of time. The outward sign of Judah's independence, which was once raised up to make possible the people's continued existence as a state, shall now correspond with its inward commission; and the opposition which has troubled all the prophets between the outward and the inward shall cease. What the nation was meant to be when Jahveh called it into being shall be represented by its King whom Jahveh has set over it. He, who has been sent by God, shall be in sympathy with the true ideals of the nation which God called into being.

There is no mention of the work of the King in safeguarding the nation. He has no mission to defend the people or to break the power of the oppressor. Jahveh shall do that, before He sends the righteous ruler (ix. 3). For this people which is now His, disciplined after His chastisement, Jahveh will provide a place in the world to do His work; and out of it He will raise up one who will fulfil the task in Judah which is Jahveh's task. The King is to be at once a scion of the stock of Jesse and one on whom God's spirit rests, for the purified nation can provide one on whom God's spirit is to rest as thoroughly as it ever did on any of the

heroes of Israel's past. He shall do the work in Judah which is allotted to Him, while Jahveh will fulfil His part in guaranteeing a place for a kingdom which serves His will. The view of the relative functions of the Messianic ruler and Jahveh is thus in close agreement with Isaiah's first message to Ahaz. The prophet promised in Jahveh's name the overthrow of the allied enemies, and urged Ahaz to bring himself and his kingdom into a right attitude to Jahveh, in the confident expectation that a nation which thus set first the will of its God could count on Him to give it a sufficient place in the day of the divine self-manifestation. When Ahaz failed him, Isaiah declared that the land was Immanuel's, and therefore, in spite of its imminent chastisement, could not be utterly overwhelmed, since Jahveh Himself would intervene to save it. Now he looks beyond the day of the divine self-manifestation, and declares what is to be its outcome in the work of Immanuel in the new land Jahveh has given. In both cases, Messiah is not He who shall smite the nations with the rod of His mouth: Jahveh will see to that.

In the close correspondence between the early prophecy of Immanuel and the promises of chs. ix. and xi. I find an answer to the difficulty which has perplexed Kautzsch and others—namely, that the Messianic promise seems so isolated in Isaiah's message and never reappears. It appeared early in a form suited to the situation of the king to whom it was first addressed, and reappears in a fully developed form here. But, further, the feature common to the prophecies of Immanuel and the scion from Jesse's stock, which gives Messiah no part in the victory over the nations, is the explanation of the note in chs. ix. and xi. which has been described as life-weariness. It is said that such an expectation of the direct divine intervention as that which is embodied in these oracles can only be the expression of the mood of a people which was

weary of strife, which could no longer anticipate for the Messianic King the power to break the oppressors of Israel, and which therefore looked away from earth to a divine Helper. What has been thus taken for life-weariness is really Isaiah's triumphant confidence in Jahveh's direct government of His world. Assyria shall fall, not by the hand of man: Messiah shall not bring in the consummation, for it is Jahveh by his direct action who gives His people their place.

To understand Isaiah's view of Messiah, we must recognise that the Old Testament has no clear doctrine by which the Spirit of Jahveh was distinguished from Jahveh Himself. "God, when influencing persons, is called the Spirit of God. The Spirit of God is not something less than God, it is God. And the Spirit of God, *i.e.* God in a person, remains distinct: He suffers no confusion or composition with the spirit of man." [44] That anyone wears divine titles is but the sign of His nearness to Jahveh and of sharing His counsel. Jahveh's Spirit rests upon him to equip him for the work to which he is sent. Thus Jahveh's Spirit clothes itself in Gideon to deliver Israel; and so long as he is acting in that capacity, he is doing Jahveh's work, and what he does is done by Jahveh Himself. In like manner the Spirit of Jahveh rests upon the scion out of the stock of Jesse to make him a true ruler of the people. That there is one out of the royal stock on whom Jahveh's Spirit can rest is a proof of how the nation, and especially the humbled royal house, have learned through their discipline. But the true government of the people in the consummation of all things is the work of Jahveh; so long as the Messianic King does this, he is doing Jahveh's work among His people.

The general conception of all the prophets was that for salvation only one thing was necessary, but this thing was absolutely necessary—namely, the direct presence of God among

His people. Isaiah gave a special expression to the general idea. Jahveh was to manifest Himself in the King Messiah (xi. 1 ff.) on the side of His nature which was essential to the national well-being; and when He fully manifested Himself as the ruler of the nation, he was to do it through Messiah (ix. 1 ff.). But to Isaiah the Messianic Kingdom in Israel was the full Kingdom of God. He did not, as we unconsciously do in our thought of the Kingdom, conceive of it as having elements which went beyond earth and time and which could only be realised outwith the limitations of the flesh. Isaiah thought of it as coming to fruition within time and on the earth. In order that this might be, there was need for a supreme intervention of Jahveh: the divine Kingdom must be set up through God's direct action, and could only endure through God's presence. Where we look beyond time for that presence of God which brings the fulness of the Kingdom in a world free from the limitations of earth, Isaiah expected the Kingdom to be set up through God coming down to the earth.[45]

Hence it is to insist on only one side of Isaiah's picture to say with Wellhausen[46] that here we have "poetry but no utopia, no world-embracing golden age." Certainly it is true that the greatness of the divine gift to Judah consists in its simplicity. The mighty King who, though endowed with heavenly gifts for his functions, yet springs from Jesse's stock, is represented within the limits of Isaiah's time. He is righteous, he makes justice something which even the lowly can enjoy, he slays the evil-doer with the breath of his mouth: and all this he does, not to the ends of the earth, but on My holy mountain—*i.e.* in Jerusalem, the capital of Judah. The representation seems to contain nothing which was not within the reach of any king who had ever sat on David's throne.

But there is one feature of the representation which shows that the prophet had in view, as the issue of the divine intervention, something more than a righteous nation, subject to a divinely appointed king and full of social righteousness. 'The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion shall graze together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall be associates . . . and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.'[47] If no more were said than that the wolf should lie down with the lamb, it might be possible to understand by it merely that the oppressor and the oppressed shall now live in peace. But the reason given for the peace, that the food of all the creatures shall then be equally innocent, proves that we are in the presence of a type of thought which conceives the outcome of the divine intervention very differently from the way in which we do.[48]

It has often been noted that this feature in Isaiah's view of the future bears a similarity to the creation story (Gen. i.), where the beasts, before man fell, are said to have lived in an idyllic condition, because they all lived on vegetable food. It has, however, been counted sufficient to note the similarity and to say that the future is to reproduce the blessed past and to mean the return of the Golden Age. Yet, since we do not know when Gen. i. was written,[49] we have not the right to take it for granted that Isaiah's picture was based on the other; and, even if he did borrow, we need to ask why one special feature, which implies that there is a disorder, not merely in man's life and man's social relations but in the whole animate creation, laid so strong a hold on Isaiah's mind. For that is what the picture means. When God's Kingdom came to pass on earth, it was to put right more than a human disorder, it must redress the order of nature. No strong moralist has ever failed to realise how hard it is to bring nature within

any scheme of human morality, and Isaiah was less likely to pass it by because, like all his fellow-countrymen, he lived closer to nature than we. The desert was at their door, and in the desert the sirocco has always killed without regard to moral considerations, and the lion pulls down the shepherd who is giving his life for the sheep.[50]

Isaiah's expectation that, when God came to dwell with men on earth, all the disorder of nature was to cease, is the proof of how there had arisen in the mind of one who saw the world as governed by one supreme will to one sovereign end, and who looked for the divine intervention in the whole world-order, the sense that more needed to be set right than the relations of men to each other. God, who was to make new conditions for His faithful people, was to make them not merely by breaking the rod of the oppressor, but by renewing the earth, the fulness of which was His glory. The prophecy is the witness of Isaiah's recognition of how much there was which needed renewal. It is at the same time the witness of how he, like Hosea, was looking for a reconciled humanity which was to dwell on a renewed earth.

But it is also the witness of how the idea of Isaiah is still the conception of Amos, only purified and raised to a higher level. The divine intervention which he came to predict, and which it was his to foresee, was an intervention in the world-order. It was the breaking in of eternity on the world of time. And, since the eternal order was an order of morality, it could be brought about by moral agents, and had for its final issue no mere destruction, but a new and perfect order of moral harmony alike in the kingdom of Judah and in the whole universe, which was in God's hands.

VII.

As a practical measure, and as a policy for the State of Judah during those troublesome and eventful years of its history, the attitude urged by Isaiah meant that Judah was to cease from the idea that it could guarantee its future by struggling for a place among the world-powers. The leaders of the little community ought rather to look to it that better order and justice governed in their internal affairs (i. 26), and that their worship was made more worthy of the God to whom it was offered (i. 10–17).[51] Then they could look forward with quietness to the coming intervention of Jahveh in the affairs of the world, because Jahveh's intervention would be for the very ends for which their State and kingdom stood, and would give them the place they needed to make these ends valid and significant before the world. The first business of the king was not to hunt for alliances from without, while he left the inner life of Judah to become the same in character as that which was found in the other heathen kingdoms. For Judah to do that was to sink its distinctive character—the character which, according to all the prophets, belonged to the nation, because Jahveh called it and made it His own people; the character which, according to Isaiah, gave it the assurance that Jahveh would not let it perish in the consummation of all things.

Here the prophet was the true patriot. His view of the national life was that it possessed something distinctive and characteristic, since it was in the world to embody Jahveh's will and to realise Jahveh's rule in Judah. When it became such, it would become something which would gather the pride and the love of the whole people, and something which would also possess endurance.

Isaiah looked for that endurance from a signal act of

intervention by which their God was to take action on behalf of the faithful. He expected that, for a people which set its heart unitedly on these great and real things, its God would rise up and give them a place in the sight of the sun. Jahveh was about to assert Himself in the world-order; and when He did, He must assert also the place of a people which was His in that order.

We naturally look in a different direction for the vindication of the great prophet's hopes, for we have learned even more than he of the power of faith. Trust in Jahveh, he said, and His intervention, when it arrives, can bring you only good. Men defined that good as national independence and outward security. But when men in Judah had learned to set their will to do the will of their God and to see the few things which greatly matter for a great life, they were sure to hold to it independently of every shock of time and circumstance. Captivity came to them and the loss of all outward position; but captivity could not alter their spiritual possession. It was something which was independent of outward circumstances, which could be asserted in any circumstances, and which remained their inalienable heritage. They could cling to it as something which was in their very constitution and make of mind. If it pleased Jahveh to give them a very different position in which this was to be asserted from that which they expected or which their great prophet may have promised, they could still, in the circumstances in which it was God's will that they should live, continue to assert it. For even Assyria, which robbed them of their independence, and Babylon, which robbed them of their country, could not rob them of the faith which made God their heritage and His presence their hope. Therefore the successor of Isaiah, who looked for God's intervention on behalf of the people soon, was the great figure of Daniel,

who in captivity looked for a city which hath foundations, and put Babylon, its threats and its promises, under his feet. But here Isaiah, like his predecessors Hosea and Amos, had broken with national religion, for he made the condition of continuance something which implied and required no national forms. He asked for faith from the rulers of Judah. It was the one essential for true religion, and it was sufficient for continuance. When the people, as a people through its accredited representatives, proved itself incapable or unwilling to exercise faith, Isaiah had broken with empirical Judah. The future belonged to the men who could exercise faith: and the new society, to which continuance was promised, must be constituted on that basis. It must be a Church, the society of the like-minded; not a Nation, the collection of the heterogeneous.

The meeting between Isaiah and Ahaz is one of the great events in the Old Testament history; but it is more, "it is typical for the battle of faith, not only with want of faith, but also with the actual world."[52] The course of conduct which the prophet recommended might have led to something which, from the point of view of the politician, was much worse than the condition which threatened Judah: it might have resulted in the immediate ruin of the kingdom. But Isaiah had come to believe that the kingdom, as it was then constituted and with the aims it represented, was not worth keeping, and that its disappearance might only have led faith to see more clearly the things which were worth keeping, and to hold them with a firmer hand. The battle of faith with the actual world is not merely to claim and fight for an outward condition which faith desires or which it counts necessary in order to be able to do its appointed work. The battle of faith is often that of accepting untoward conditions, of not being turned aside by them from

its true ends, and of proving how even in the most untoward conditions it can meet the world with a high heart.

We are so impressed with the duty which lies upon the Church of seeking to change the conditions of the outward world that we are apt to call a man like Isaiah who saw a different task a quietist, and to pass away from him as though he could have nothing to say to us.

Isaiah sought to turn Ahaz to the duty of making his kingdom an instrument of God's will on the earth, and then leaving the outward world in God's hands. When his effort was vain and his protest failed, he did not become a politician nor did he try to set up a party to overturn the Assyrian alliance into which Ahaz had brought Judah. True to his convictions, he accepted the course of events, and taught his followers that men could live by faith even under conditions against which they had vehemently protested. His counsel was that under the condition of vassalage to Assyria men should do the work which lay to their hand and leave the ordering of outward events to God who was behind them. They must not plot to change their outward condition, which was beyond their power, but give their full attention to that which was put within their power by their God. In His own time God would order what seemed to Him necessary for the full outcome of their task.

And when the Church has succeeded in altering, in the outward condition of the world, in its economics, its war, its social organisation, many things which have greatly hindered and do still hinder the coming of the Kingdom, there will always remain, in the unchangeable conditions of this strange world in which God has been pleased to set mankind, enough to make the task of faith which Isaiah counselled—namely, the acceptance of the conditions which men cannot change and the humble ordering of the lives which by God's

grace men can change—a great and enduring reality. And, above all, there will remain enough to make us sure that the consummation is something which God only can give. For when the world has been so ordered that it gives all its best, man is still a great creature: *et inquietum cor nostrum, donec requiescat in Te.*

CHAPTER VII.

DEUTERONOMY.

Into the perplexing and much-debated question of the composition of this book it is not necessary to enter here; but one may venture to express the opinion that none of the solutions which have been offered is entirely satisfactory, and that the last word on the question has not been spoken. While this, however, is the case, it remains true that there is an unmistakable similarity of tone in all the literary outcome of the Deuteronomic school, whether that is represented by the legal and hortatory sections of Deuteronomy itself or by the additions made to the historical books by editors who revised them in the light of the ideals of the school. The remarkable unanimity of outlook and aim which reflects itself in the language suggests that we have to do with a body of men who have passed under one common influence and who were able to represent, not the individual opinions of the few, but the general attitude of religious men in Israel. The remarkable disappearance of their influence in the writings of Israel and the rise of what is justly described as the priestly school not only support this opinion, but suggest how in the new conditions to which Judah was exposed at the time of the exile, fresh questions of religion and duty emerged and broke up the earlier temporary unanimity. For a little time, however, Judah gathered itself to express "the views of divine truth and duty" which prevailed in its midst, and the result was Deuteronomy.

That a great part of the material which has been incorporated into the book was old is probable in itself, since any code of law which is to be accepted by a community must contain what the community through its past experience has learned to value; and the fact has been brought out by the careful studies of Stärk, Steuernagel and Puukko. But, since the old material was placed in a new setting and is used to embody a new aim, it is legitimate to neglect the question of the sources from which individual laws came and to insist on the new light in which the Deuteronomists placed even their traditional material.

To my mind, the community of outlook and aim extends over chs. v.–xi., so that I regard these chapters as no mere hortatory introduction which owes its origin to another hand, but as an integral part of the book. And, while the historical introduction in chs. i.–iv. has been expanded (notably in ch. iv.), it has been expanded by a writer who was so thoroughly possessed by the spirit which governs the rest of the book, that positions which appear in these chapters may at least be justly appealed to in support of positions which appear in the body of the book. Chs. xxvii., xxix. ff., however, have a very different character, and have not been used as witnesses to the aims of the Deuteronomists.

I.

The reason why a reform which appealed to the whole people and represented the aims of all religious men in the community could be carried through in Jerusalem is found in the fact that in Judah the alliance, in the sense of community of ideals, between prophecy and priesthood had always been closer than it was in Northern Israel. The revolt against Ahab and Baalism was carried out in the

North by the prophets, and, so far as we know, received no support from the priests; but the similar revolt against Athaliah, who sought the same ends as her father in Jerusalem, was led by the priests (2 Kings xi.). The priests of the capital were less under the control of the court. Jeroboam I. appointed to the priesthood men who were not of the sons of Levi (1 Kings xii. 31 ff.), and who were therefore directly dependent on the royal will. While David made his sons priests, these were associated with Zadok and Abiathar (2 Sam. viii. 17 f., xx. 25), who represented an older and independent tradition. Apparently, too, while abuses existed in the cult at Jerusalem and throughout Judah, these were not so profound as those which rendered the cult of the Northern kingdom half-heathen. Hence neither Isaiah nor Micah dwells so long or so severely on the debasing influence of the national worship as do Amos and Hosea. Hence, too, Isaiah was able to see his vision of Jahveh under the forms of the temple worship; it is no exaggeration to say that Hosea could never have conceived Jahveh as employing for His self-revelation any of the forms of worship at a Northern sanctuary.[1]

This community of ideals in the prophetic and priestly circles at Jerusalem has brought it about that the Deuteronomic reform was the work of all who were interested in the religious life of the nation, and represented a sincere effort to bring the great prophetic teaching into contact with the life of the nation as a whole through the means of its religious institutions. If the prophets' work had failed to create some forms of national worship which, however inadequately, could embody their teaching as to God's nature or to remould the older forms so as to express these ideals, their work would have passed with little result. The reformers realised that the great words of the prophets could never become the common property of

the nation till they passed from being words into customs, which men practise before they understand them, and which mould their thoughts before these have become conscious. We all limit our conception of the ideal unduly by thinking of it only as that to which we aspire, and by forgetting the appropriated ideals which, having sunk down into our habits, influence us the more deeply because we do not and cannot trace their influence. "Truly the East is eternally the mother of religions, for the reason that she has assimilated as ordinary social functions what the West holds to be only the duty of officialism or the message of the Church."

Again, the reformers realised that the words of the prophets were spent in the air, so long as in many villages throughout the country rites were being practised which in their fundamental principles contradicted the aims of the prophets. All the prophets had declared that Jahveh was about to intervene in the nation's life, and that on this intervention must follow a national overthrow. They had declared that the reason for the overthrow was to be found in the people's sin, prominent in which were its debased cult and its unworthy institutions. The reformers, who aimed at securing the continuance of their people, were compelled, among the means by which they sought that end, to regulate the worship, the value of which was proved by the fact that its abuse had roused Jahveh's anger. Because they knew how much the sacrificial worship meant for the life of their nation, they could not leave aside the needs which it satisfied, since they knew that the sure outcome of their neglect would be that the abuses connected with it must continue. The inarticulate common soul of the people had no other way in which it could express itself except through its religious ritual; for the literature, as the sources from which the stories in JE were borrowed reveal, needed much editing

before it could purely serve the faith, and the prophet by his very nature was an occasional and fugitive voice. No religion, which has ever functioned as a religion, has remained as a theism which accepted and commanded no acts of worship save good works of a social type. The reformers were seeking a means by which the people's sense of their relation to their God might be worthily expressed, and they found the test of its worthiness in the ideals as to Jahveh and His relations to Israel on which the prophets had insisted.[2]

But, further, the teaching of the prophets directly led to some reform. They had all believed and insisted that Jahveh, the source and vindicator of the eternal moral ideal, was also the historic God of Israel, who had intervened in historic acts to create a nation, which must express in all its life His will. 'You alone,' said Amos, 'have I known of all the families of the earth' (iii. 2). Hosea taught: 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him and called My son out of Egypt' (xi. 1). Isaiah insisted that there was a purpose of Jahveh which Israel must count it its glory to serve. Jahveh had come into a relation toward His people which was expressed through concrete outward acts: the life and worship of His nation must in definite outward form correspond with this reality.

Hence the Deuteronomic religion is no teaching of abstract truths, or rather it is more, for it is coloured through and through with the sense that He in whose name these truths are announced stands in a peculiar historic relation to the people of Israel. The decalogue, which prescribes the universal duties of humanity, is introduced by the statement of the right Jahveh has to prescribe these things to this people (v. 6), and has no hesitation about setting the ritual observance of the sabbath, with its historic associations (vers. 12–15), among the universal and eternal laws. The nature festivals,

with the joy at harvest and vintage and firstfruits, are provided with historic references by which the people are to remind themselves how the land with all its outcome is Jahveh's gift (xvi. 1–17). The annual ritual of xxvi. 1–11, which is unique in Deuteronomy and is prescribed as the act of every private Israelite, is so framed that thereby the offerer owns himself to be part of a nation which holds a peculiar relation to God.

We are apt to be content to say that such legislation was necessary, since by no other means could the mass of the people be permeated by the quiet leaven of its faith. The faith of the prophets, we think, must come down to colour the little observances of life. But this hardly does justice to the attitude of the men who framed the new code. Neither to the prophet nor to the priest of ancient Israel did the faith come down when it took cognizance of these things. Jahveh, their God, once gave them their land, their law, their priesthood, their kingdom, their prophets. Nothing they did in their land, nothing their institutions expressed, could be insignificant any more.

Deuteronomy, therefore, is the effort to remould the national life and the national institutions in order to make these the worthy means by which men might express their sense of the will and nature of their God—a will and a nature which the framers of the code have learned to know better through the prophetic teaching.

Only when one recognises this fact can one understand the incomplete character of the Deuteronomic legislation. As it stands, the book does not present a code which covers the whole field of the people's life, and from which, therefore, it is possible to determine the nature of that life, either on its religious or its social side. If we were to take the book by itself and attempt on the basis of it alone to build up a

picture of the government or worship of ancient Israel, we should soon find how great are the gaps in the system. Thus there is no law concerning the king which can determine how he was appointed or what were the exact functions he fulfilled. So far as Deuteronomy is concerned, he might really have no functions to fulfil: the law-book merely says what he must not be and what he must not do (xvii. 14–20). Even when it is said that he must act after the rule given by this law (vers. 18–20), and so an apparently positive definition is given of his duties, all that is meant by the command is that he is not to be like the kings of the other nations. "There are given only the modifications which this institution, borrowed from כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם (all the nations) in Israel's neighbourhood, is to experience, when it is transferred to the people of Jahveh."[3] In the same way, the legislation as to the sacrifices does not prescribe how the priests are to be found or how they are to be instituted into their functions; it takes it for granted that there are priests already in existence, and that they know both their duties and the way in which these shall be fulfilled. Illustrations of the same character could be multiplied, but these two, which deal with men and matters that were of the highest importance to the welfare of the State, are sufficient to show how everywhere the code is drafted by men who are basing their work on a system which is already in existence and in action.

It is no sufficient explanation of this fact to say that the book is meant for the people, as over against the public functionaries, whether civil or religious. The statement is true, but does not recognise the full facts of the situation. For when it is said to the people that their king shall not be a foreigner, the command takes it for granted that the people have some means of making their will known in connection with the appointment of the king, and that they know how

to do it. When the people are bidden bring their causes for judgment to the judge who shall be in those days (xvii. 8 ff.), the rule again takes for granted an existing system, according to which the judges are appointed. If the chief distinction of Deuteronomy were that it is meant to direct the people, one might expect that, exactly on the points which closely concerned their daily life, they would receive direction as to how they should act. Instead, one is everywhere confronted by the fact that there is a system which is in force and which is well known, and that Deuteronomy only interferes at certain points in this established system.

Again, the Deuteronomic legislation is singularly sporadic. It touches, here and there, on questions of ritual and of social legislation, on matters of marriage, on the royal power, on conduct in war. On none of these subjects does it present a full view such as would enable a reader to determine from the book alone the attitude of old Israel on the questions involved. And not only are points in connection with a larger question selected, but there is no apparent system in the selection of the particular matters on which the book insists.

Some of the details seem to a modern reader trifling or even irrational. Many of them, running out as they do into formal precepts, give an air of ritual prescription to the law in which they occur. They seem on certain occasions pointless, and at others singularly incapable of being brought into a system.[4] It is only when one recognises that these are generally the points where the Deuteronomist desired to lay special emphasis or to alter some previously existing rule that one understands this phenomenon.

If we can group these together, and see that they show one definite aim which gives the reason for their having been selected, we shall both bring better order into them and grasp

the aim which has dictated apparently heterogeneous and sporadic acts of legislation. The recognition of the fact that they are generally changes dictated by one general aim, and not a complete legislation, makes it easier to discover the bent of the men who framed the law. Since they were working over a previously existing system with a definite purpose of amending it, they found it necessary to alter certain regulations and to emphasise certain others which brought out their aim, but they were also able to leave untouched a great deal, which required no amendment and was already in force. And what they did do will show to a careful student still more clearly what they aimed at accomplishing in their new legislation than if they had framed a legislation *de novo* which covered the whole field of their nation's activities.

There is, of course, a serious risk of mistake to be recognised in such treatment of the book, and the risk is double. Construe the legislation of Deuteronomy as essentially a means of safeguarding the nation against certain dangers by insisting on certain sides of its worship and its life, and it becomes largely a protest and a stricter definition. It is a protest against forms of idolatry and heathen ritual which were threatening the religious life of the nation through effacing the distinctive character of the Jahveh-worship. "Not a few details which to the modern eye seem trivial or irrational disclose to the student of Semitic antiquity an energetic protest against the moral grossness of Canaanite heathenism." But, unfortunately for our purposes, Canaanite heathenism as it existed then has passed away. We do not know it, we only build it up through hints and rituals and analogies from other kindred faiths; and we therefore run the risk of misunderstanding the protest, because we know so little of that against which the protest is made.

Further, if in certain points Deuteronomy seeks to bring

out more clearly sides of the Israelite faith which needed a stronger emphasis and to remove certain features of the popular worship which had proved a snare, we are again in the difficulty that we do not know thoroughly the pre-deuteronomic worship and faith. We have to recognise that just because Deuteronomy did its work, that against which it protested has passed away. And we have to face the fact that we may blunder, since we may, *e.g.*, regard as a new piece of legislation what is more correctly construed as an insistence on something which was already present but which needed to be brought more sharply forward.

We must take the risks, recognising that here as everywhere else no conclusions are perfectly sure. And recognising the limitations of our knowledge, we must be careful to deal in broad lines and along general principles.

II.

Deuteronomy opens its series of regulations by contrasting the covenant which it contains with the covenant which was made with the fathers (v. 3). What it has to declare is a new thing, the greatness of which consists chiefly in this, that it is of such a nature that it could be briefly and clearly made known to the whole people. Jahveh uttered it, speaking face to face with them as a people. Because it is the utterance of Jahveh, its character rests primarily on the character of the God who utters it. And since it is a covenant, its influence for good or ill on the people is determined by whether they can remain constant to its primary requirement, whole-hearted allegiance to Him.

Hence, through chs. vi.–xi. the book proceeds to develop these themes in a form which is really a hortatory commentary on the three first commandments of the decalogue. That there

is to be no other god in Israel, is at once the content of the first commandment and the content of the section (vi. 1–15); the section which follows (vi. 16–25) proceeds to show how on this primary truth rests the whole future of the nation. There is to be no intercourse with the inhabitants of the land into which Jahveh is bringing Israel, and, in order to avoid the danger which attended all such intercourse, the emblems and idolatrous customs of these nations are to be utterly destroyed: on this rests the certainty that Jahveh will deliver over the nations, in spite of their superior power and their superior numbers, into the hand of Israel (ch. vii.). When the people have won their land, they must be careful to remember that the land is Jahveh's gift, and to avoid the pride of heart and the following other gods to which forgetfulness might tempt them (ch. viii.). The choice of Israel by Jahveh did not rest on their righteousness any more than on their numbers: the people are His instrument to blot out the wickedness which has offended Him in the Canaanites. Since they have been chosen out of God's mercy, they must be heedful to requite it by their obedience (chs. ix., x.). And all this concludes with a promise of success and strength, which is based on the faithfulness of their God (ch. xi.).

What is here developed and emphasised is that the people have a unique character, which rests on their relation to their God. Jahveh is alone in His power; to Him belong the heavens and the earth. He is unique in His character, and He has made this known to Israel, and to Israel alone. He has a purpose which takes a wider sweep than all His dealings with His own nation, yet He has made Israel in order that it may serve His purpose. Israel, which is His creation and His instrument, must preserve its peculiar characteristics. Its relation to the other nations is determined for it by the truth, that to it

alone has Jahveh any direct relation. Its worship must be determined by the principle, that nothing suggestive of the worship of other gods may find place in its ritual.

What is thus affirmed in broad, positive, general terms required to be developed into distinct prescriptions as to what was permitted and forbidden in the life of the nation. In particular it implied, because of the condition in which Judah was then placed, the careful abolition of every rite and emblem which had any association with the other faiths, whether the older faiths of Palestine or the religions of the surrounding peoples. Here is the point of connection between chs. v.–xi. and xii.–xxvi., between the hortatory section which develops the positive side of Jahveh's character and relation to His people and the laws which safeguard these life-giving truths by prescribing in detail what must be avoided in Israel. The aim is expressed in the most general terms when it is said that, once the Israelites are settled in Palestine, they shall not inquire saying, 'How do these nations serve their gods, that I may do likewise?' (xii. 30). This is no rule against idolatry, the worship of other gods: it is a rule against the transference of heathen methods of worship to Jahveh. The God of Israel, because He has His own character, which has been stated in chs. v.–xi., cannot be worshipped by rites which have an alien origin, and which inevitably bring with them the suggestion of the nature of the god in whose honour they were originally instituted.

The broad general statement is accordingly developed in great detail. If the general principle be grasped, the sporadic appearance of the details disappears, since they are seen to subserve a common aim.

Idolatry is forbidden on pain of death (xiii. 7–12, 13–19), even though a prophet should recommend it (2–6). Israel

is further forbidden to plant an *asherah* beside Jahveh's altar (xvi. 21) or to erect a *mazzebah* (xvi. 22). These emblems, which were once innocently employed, have proved themselves mischievous, since they carry with them something of the character of the gods to whom they were first erected. Religious prostitution is forbidden (xxiii. 18 f.). A eunuch is refused admission into the *qahal* (xxiii. 2), because self-castration was a heathen rite, and a man who was thus mutilated brought into the worshipping assembly the sign of his allegiance to another god. Men shall not wear women's clothes, nor women those of men (xxii. 5): the custom was part of the ritual of certain Eastern faiths—as, *e.g.*, that of the bearded Astarte of Cyprus.[5] The Israelite shall make no baldness for the dead (xiv. 1): the practice originally implied sacrifice to the gods who governed the under-world.[6] All necromancy is forbidden (xviii. 9–20), both because the custom implies the recognition of another god than Jahveh (ver. 13)[7] and because Jahveh has provided for this need of His people by His prophets (vers. 14 ff.). The amulets are purged of their heathen taint and transformed into phylacteries (vi. 8 f.).

The insertion of the laws as to clean and unclean animals (xiv. 3–20) is to be explained from the same religious point of view.[8] Every question in connection with these laws has not been determined,[9] but the general principle is clear that the animals the use of which was forbidden to the Hebrews had been or were still holy in other rituals, so that anyone who employed them in Israel detracted from the people's holiness to Jahveh (xiv. 21). It is of course possible that the habitual abstinence from such food came to create an æsthetic feeling of disgust at its use. Thus the Church during the mediæval period forbade the use of horse-flesh, because the ritual eating of the horse formed part of the

worship of the god Thor; and so successfully did the disgust at the forbidden food plant itself in men's minds that it was able to survive the reason for its adoption and to create an instinctive abhorrence for a wholesome and clean food.[10] In the same way the Israelites may have contracted a racial disgust at pig, which has survived all the religions which sacrificed the pig. But the basis was religious, and Deuteronomy was legislating in the direction of keeping Jahveh's character and worship unique.

Again, in the interests of the purity of the faith, severe restrictions are laid on the intercourse of Israel with its heathen neighbours: Israel is forbidden to enter into any treaty with the Canaanites or to intermarry with them (vii. 1–4).

The legislation on the former subject runs out into the impossible command that the Israelites shall exterminate the Canaanites (xx. 16–18); but, though it casts the warning into an archæological, and therefore an extreme, form, it recognised and guarded against a contact by which the religion had always been infected. Every treaty with a foreigner in ancient times involved some recognition of an alien god, and this was especially the case where the treaty implied the political subordination of one nation to another. When Ahaz of Judah met his Assyrian suzerain at Damascus and brought back the pattern of an altar which he had seen there (2 Kings xvi. 9–16), his act was not prompted by mere æsthetic admiration for a new style of church furniture: it was the recognition of his having entered into relation to the god of Assyria as well as to its king.[11] Where nation and national god were conceived as living in a common life, alliance with a foreign nation implied some recognition of its god. Israel is forbidden to bring Jahveh into any such relation: there is none with

whom He, who is supreme and unique, may enter into any alliance.

It must not, however, be supposed that the extreme form into which the legislation on this subject was cast implies that the attitude Israel was required to take was a theoretic ideal based on the past and representing the ideals of men who were thinking back on old mistakes. In the form in which we possess them, the laws must have been framed at a period when at least Northern Israel was peopled by settlers from the heathen countries of the East, and when no part of the little country of Judah was free from the influence of imported foreigners. The danger was the greater at the time, and the influence of these settlers more powerful, because the religious customs of the strangers were practised by men who were supported by the conqueror. The Israelite is not to suffer himself to fall into the sense that the political supremacy of the heathen carries with it their moral and religious dominance. He is to preserve against them the consciousness that his faith was once that of the dominant people, and that Palestine is Jahveh's heritage.

That the interest in the question, however, was purely religious, and that the precept against entering into close relations with the foreigner was no race-hatred based on difference of nationality, is proved by the attitude which the Deuteronomists take to the *gerim*, or uitlanders. These settlers of foreign race within the land, who have found asylum in Israel or are passing traders,[12] carry with them no real peril to the distinctive religion of the country where they have made their home. So far are they, therefore, from being molested on the ground of difference of race that they are commended repeatedly and urgently to the charity of the people, and in this respect are set on the same level with the widow and the orphan. And the motive for their mild

treatment is drawn from the religion itself, in which they can take no part save to benefit from its mildness.[13]

Again, the rule against intermarriage with the Canaanites recognises another influence which must have deeply infected the Jahveh-faith. Rachel, sitting on the teraphim which she had brought with her from her father's house (Gen. xxxi. 34), must have been a frequent figure in every Hebrew household in that period of national intermixture. The influence which women can and do exercise, even in a religion, perhaps more especially in a religion which, like the Hebrew faith, was peculiarly fitted for men, does not need any emphasis. But here again the interest of the legislators is not in the purity of the race but in the purity of the faith, for they permit marriage with a beautiful captive (xxi. 10 ff.) after the girl has been separated from her heathen customs. It is the solitary character of Israel, separate from the nations, which they would safeguard; and they would safeguard it because its solitary character is the expression of the character of the God it worships. Israel is Jahveh's bride, to bear His name, and His only.

III.

To attain its end, Deuteronomy insists upon two special reforms which are often put forward as the leading characteristics of the legislation, but which are really corollaries from its fundamental principle and the means of making this dominate the actual life of the people. These reforms are leading characteristics in the sense that they were the visible and tangible results of the legislation, and, as such, they caught men's eye and came to be represented as though they were the main matters at which the reformers aimed. We can only be just to their work when we recognise that the outward reforms were only means to a greater end.

The first of these was the nationalisation of the worship; the second was its centralisation at Jerusalem.

What I mean by the nationalisation of the worship is that a deliberate effort was made to suppress the local sacrifices of clan and family,[14] and with this end in view it was determined that private sacrifices should only be permitted at the central sanctuary, where they were under more careful regulation. The historian who relates the introduction of the Deuteronomic law marks as the outstanding feature of the passover which was celebrated by Josiah that it was celebrated, not by the people in their own homes, but by the united nation at Jerusalem, and he adds that such a thing had never before been seen in Israel (2 Kings xxiii. 21–23). When Deuteronomy represented its nationalised and centralised cult as being a return to the conditions which prevailed under Moses, it was fundamentally in the right. The scattered clans which made up the Israelite invasion were only bound together by the tie of their religion, and this religion must have had its centre for their worship.[15] But the conquest, gradual and piecemeal as it had been, made it necessary that, if the worship was to be practised at all, it must be practised by the several tribes at local sanctuaries. We know how difficult it was in later times for the men of Galilee to reach Jerusalem because of the intervening Samaritans, and can understand how impossible it must have been, when the plain of Esdraelon was occupied by a belt of strong Canaanite cities, for the Northern tribes to keep in touch with a religious centre in the South. To support this outcome of the temporary condition of the people came also the older conception of the clan as a society for all the purposes of common life, among which worship was reckoned as the chief.[16] The change was inevitable and wholesome, for the religion, in the condition of the people, could not have

continued at all had it not been able and willing to use such centres as were within its reach. But the tribes, coarsened by the conquest and scattered among the heathen, were peculiarly exposed to the danger of borrowing elements from the worship which was practised around them. The syncretism of the pre-prophetic period had its strongest support and its deepest roots in the local sanctuaries.[17]

Deuteronomy seeks to gather up these local sacrifices and rites into a truly national worship. It cuts at the roots of the family and tribal sacrifices when it forbids the offering of sacrifice elsewhere than at the central sanctuary (xii. 13–19, 27). But it does more than merely forbid. It provides the great festivals, which had their close association with the spring sowing and the harvest, and which, being common to all men, brought the people into contact with their heathen neighbours, with motives taken from the history of Jahveh's dealings with His people. The people, when they come together to worship their God, are to come to a shrine which has associations with their national life and with that alone; and they are to worship through forms which continually impress upon them the unity of their historic life as a people. Even when the private man comes to offer his personal recognition of Jahveh's bounty to him, he does it through a ritual in which he recounts how he belongs to a nation with a past which is great because it is full of God's grace (xxvi. 1–11).

It is not without significance that, whenever the reformers insisted on the great festivals as national affairs in which the whole people were to take their part, they so continually added the statement that the widow and the orphan, the *ger* and the Levite shall have their share. At ch. xvi. the males of the community are to appear three times in the year at Jerusalem for the festivals, but these

others shall have their share in the local rejoicing (xvi. 11, 14). The ordinary tithe is to be taken to Jerusalem and there consumed by the household, with the Levite receiving his portion (xiv. 22–28); but a special tithe for the third year is ordained (vers. 28 f.), in which not only the Levite but the widow, the fatherless, and the *ger* shall receive a portion. It is easy to see that the local celebrations had drifted into the hands of little close corporations of the tolerably well-to-do, who contributed to their expense; and that there was growing up a body of people who, through their poverty and their inability to contribute to the common rejoicing, were being practically shut out of any share in the national worship. Amos represented one of these local festivals as having degenerated into a mere junketing on the part of the well-to-do burghers, who cynically ignored the rights of the poor (ii. 7 f.). The reformers are seeking to emphasise through the religious rites the human brotherhood of all Israelites. They would have even those who are unable to contribute much to such celebrations take part in them. The nation, as a nation and in all its parts, is to offer its common worship. And just as the poor and the *gerim* have their portion in the common worship, so they have their part in the common teaching. They shall hear the meaning and have the opportunity to learn the purpose of the rites to which they are admitted (xxxi. 10–12).

In all this, Deuteronomy was seeking to embody one of the great truths on which prophecy had insisted, how that which made the bond of the national life was the people's common dependence on Jahveh. Its dependence was to find expression in rites which united the entire nation in their celebration, and which were also distinctive of the people as a people.

The second practical reform by which Deuteronomy

sought to preserve the peculiar character of Israel's worship was the centralisation of the cult at Jerusalem. I place it here because, though it was outwardly the most significant act of the reformers and the act which made the largest change in the habits of the worshippers, though it also brought with it momentous results in the doctrine as well as in the religious habits of Israel, it was at first a piece of practical legislation rather than a change which implied any conviction. It was a means of enforcing their fundamental principle, but was never regarded as a principle in itself.[18]

It has sometimes been said, and is often carelessly repeated, that the insistence on the part of the Deuteronomists on the unity of God brought with it as its logical consequence the recognition of the unity of the place of worship—the one God, it was felt, must have but one sanctuary.[19] But there is no necessary connection between the unity of God and the unity of the place in which He may be worshipped; and, fortunately, the Deuteronomist never says that there is.

How the regulation was regarded, and how relative was the value set upon it by those who framed it, can be clearly seen from the fact that the code has admitted in one place what is apparently an extract from an earlier law, in which more altars than one are regarded as admissible (xvi. 21). Had the unity of the place of worship been construed as a principle, it is hard to understand why such a sentence was allowed to remain.[20] And a further indication of the authors' point of view appears through the way in which relaxations are admitted in the application of their new rule. If Jerusalem was too far from the place where the worshipper lived, he was at liberty to alter the method of his worship (xii. 20 ff.). Evidently the fact that his act of worship could not be performed at the central sanctuary did not in itself make his act invalid. Because of the subordinate importance of

the regulation, no penalty is prescribed in the case of a man who may disobey the law of the central sanctuary, while the penalties which are to be inflicted on anyone who worships another god than Jahveh are severe and detailed. The reformers are clearly conscious of the difference between a principle and a regulation, a law and a priestly ordinance.

The situation became materially different in later Judaism, as soon as sacrifice was provided with a theory which made not only the central sanctuary, but the priesthood and ritual which could only exist at such a sanctuary, an essential for worship. In the later Levitical legislation Jahveh and Israel are far more widely separated than in Deuteronomy; and the sanctuary has become a holy place in the sense that Jahveh has separated it from common places, and has ordained the means by which alone the people can approach Him there. In order that worship in any place may be legitimate, there is need of a complicated ritual and an official priesthood, since Jahveh's holiness is so construed that for an ordinary Israelite to approach Him anywhere without elaborate regulations and the mediating priesthood would have disastrous results. "On this theory the ritual of the sanctuary is no artificial system, devised to glorify one holy place above others, but the necessary scheme of precaution for every local approach to God. Other sanctuaries are not less holy . . . they are places where His holiness is not revealed, and therefore are not and cannot be sanctuaries of Jehovah at all. If Jehovah were to meet with man in a second sanctuary, the same consequences of inviolable holiness would assert themselves, and the new holy place would again require to be fenced in with equal ritual precautions. In the very nature of the covenant there is but one altar and one priesthood through which the God of Israel can be approached." [21]

It is a legitimate thing to ask whether the prescription

of one particular place of worship does not bring with it as an inevitable consequence the demand for some theory to explain why sacrifices offered elsewhere are invalid: and it is an interesting question to resolve how the Priestly Code shows the growth of the theory. But the limits of our field of study make it impossible to enter fully into either line of discussion. All that it concerns us here to notice is that the theory of sacrifice, which of itself makes the one sanctuary a necessity because it bases its existence on principle, is not yet present in Deuteronomy: the worshipper can come to the altar and lay upon it his gift.[22] The regulation as to one temple was the practical means by which it was sought to remove the people's worship from places which were contaminated with heathen associations and degraded by foul rites, but it was no more.[23] The reformers took this method of cleansing their worship, because Jahveh demanded a worship which embodied His character.

Now the fact that the legislation as to the people's worship gathers round certain great principles, that it seeks to emphasise certain convictions as to Jahveh's character and His relation to the people, that it adopts means to safeguard the faith from the perils which experience had proved to be very real, deserves attention from another side. It explains, to my mind, how the men who promulgated it were able, despite the great change it caused in the nation's habits, to present it with the just sense that it was Mosaic. There can be no question but that, when they put it into the mouth of Moses though at a later period than the code of Horeb, they claimed for it his authority. There can also be no question but that Israel's religion was profoundly altered from the date of the Deuteronomic code.

I have already pointed out how the centralisation of the cult was really no novelty, but represented an older practice

which had the sanction of belonging to the time of the unity and youth of the people. It was a return, when circumstances made a return practicable, to a custom which had all the claims of antiquity. But this is a formal and outward thing, which only points to something more fundamental. When one reads the ritual prescriptions of Ex. xxxiv., which are earlier than Deuteronomy, one recognises how the weakness of the early code on one side and its strength on another is the absence of positive legislation. I mean that it embodies so little of that which constitutes the essential character of the God whom the people worship. Sacrifice is to be offered to Jahveh, and to Him alone. To Him the people owe their land and their existence as a nation; to Him, therefore, they bring their grateful homage, as they would bring their offerings of homage to their king, and as the heathen bring their homage to their gods. The occasions of making the offering are the natural occasions when they recognise how much they owe to Him who gives all good gifts. The vintage feast, the harvest thanksgiving, celebrated at the seasons when Jahveh has blessed them, are the natural times when their gratitude demands expression. But the outward forms in which this gratitude expresses itself have not been exactly prescribed, and are little different from the forms in which Canaanite and Moabite acknowledge their dependence upon their gods. What makes the difference in the worship is found, not in its outward form, but in the thoughts of him who offers it. "To a people which 'knows Jahveh,' this unambitious service, in which the expression of grateful homage to Him runs through all the simple joys of a placid agricultural life, was sufficient to form the visible basis of a pure and earnest piety. But its forms gave no protection against deflection into heathenism and immorality when Jahveh's spiritual nature and moral precepts were forgotten. The feasts and sacrifices

still run their accustomed round when Jahveh was practically confounded with the Baalim and there was no more truth or mercy or knowledge of God in the land (Hos. iv. 1)." [24]

Now Deuteronomy in all its prescriptions as to the ritual seeks to safeguard the worship, and thereby the faith which that worship expresses, by removing from it everything which has a peculiarly heathen provenance. It is of the nature of exactly that positive legislation which was wanting in Ex. xxxiv., etc., and it is this on the ground of an experience of the danger to which the popular worship was exposed through the want of such legislation. The prophets have made clear how Jahveh has come to be one among the heathen deities, and have pointed to the ritual as one of the most powerful influences in hiding Jahveh's distinctive character. The reformers seek to supply a form of ritual which shall safeguard the people from this abuse.

All this is capable of being construed as a legitimate and inevitable development. Clearer definitions in religion, whether they arise along the line of positive ritual prescriptions or along the line of creed definition, are not the arbitrary outcome of priestly ingenuity: they arise from the danger of heresy. Men began to define their creed as they began to prescribe their ritual, not because they were perversely inclined to depart from simpler statements or simpler practices, but because they felt themselves compelled to safeguard the faith.

When one regards the matter from this side, one is able, I think, to understand why the Deuteronomists could legitimately call their legislation with all its changes and new developments Mosaic, just as the Nicene fathers could call the creed which they framed Christian and could claim for it the authority of the apostles. I do not, of course, wish to express any opinion on the final validity of either the one

development or the other: all I wish to do is to insist that both are equally explicable and equally justifiable.

IV.

The basis for the peculiar character of the nation and its worship is found by the Deuteronomist in a historic act of Israel's God: to him, as to Hosea, the fundamental thing in religion is that which God has done. But the God who has entered into relation to Israel is the ruler of the whole world. The truth is deliberately and explicitly taught (iv. 35, 39, vi. 4, vii. 9, x. 17); but it has passed too deeply into the minds of the writers for its influence to be proved merely by a few statements in their book. Thus it is the conviction that God, to whom belongs illimitable power, has deigned to enter into relations to a little people, and out of His free grace has elected it, which forms the foundation of the people's confidence in their future and governs their attitude towards their future.[25] And it is this conviction which gives the motive for the φόβος καὶ μεγάλη χαρά (Matt. xxviii. 8) which are expected to characterise the people's temper of mind, as they characterised the disciples after the Resurrection. Fear and joy are not the two poles round which Israel's mind is to move: fear and joy are blended together, because the great deeds which prove Jahveh's power are the deeds which He has wrought on their behalf (x. 21). The conviction of the Almighty as Israel's God is the basis for all the Deuteronomic ethics.[26]

The Deuteronomist, then, sets in the forefront of all that determines the relation of the people to their God the historic fact of their choice by Jahveh (iv. 7, vii. 6 f., x. 15, xiv. 2; cf. xxvi. 18 f.). That this, with all it implies, should be the case is to be a marvel to them (iv. 32 ff.), for Israel is

the least of the nations. The land they hold is God's gift (xi. 31, etc.), and they are to say, in the annual ritual of the firstfruits (xxvi. 1–11), that their life, individual and national, is based on the reality of their God's mercy.

The divine mercy, manifested in the two historic acts of the Exodus and the conquest, which made them a nation and gave them a land, is so unchangeable that even the rebellion of the people could not turn it back (ch. ix.). The Deuteronomist expresses the unchangeable character of God's mercy by saying that Jahveh entered into a covenant with His people. Now the covenant has a double sense in Deuteronomy, but the sense which concerns us here is that it expresses how Jahveh has entered into definite and enduring relations with Israel. The writer speaks of three covenants which Jahveh made with Israel: the covenant with Abraham (vi. 10, vii. 8), the covenant at Horeb (v. 2), the covenant at Moab (v. 3); but he also speaks of the covenant as a sort of abstract thing which stands behind every historic evidence of it (xvii. 2, xxxi. 16, 20; Josh. vii. 11, 15, xxiii. 16; Judg. ii. 1, 20; 1 Kings xix. 14; 2 Kings xvii. 15, 35, 38).[27] He thus expresses his sense of how, in the great acts of grace which emerged on the field of history, was revealed the nature of Him who therein manifested Himself. There is a saving purpose in Him who created the nation for His own ends which gives sureness to Israel's relation to its God. He who made it a people is its God, with whom men can from year to year enter into quiet and glad relation. They have a calm ground of confidence for their prayers. Their gratitude is acceptable to Him, and the firstfruits which express their gratitude come up on His altar. They worship One who is not a God of caprice, for they know His mind toward them.

Accordingly, Deuteronomy lays no stress on the deliverance from Egypt by itself and does not refer to it as

an isolated fact, in the way Amos and Hosea do. That initial act is represented as a mere preliminary to the permanent relation in which Israel stands towards its God. And, because the relation is thought of as permanent, the nation is naturally conceived to have a continuous life. The writer identifies the men at Moab immediately before the entrance into the holy land with the men at Horeb, both in v. 2 f., where he speaks of the introduction of the law, and in his historical introduction (i. 6, 19 ff., 26 ff.). He pays, therefore, no attention to the death of the generation in the wilderness, but, treating this as a mere episode in the continuous life of the people, speaks as though it were the same men who received the law at Horeb and who listened to Moses' charge at Moab.[28] It is a nation now existing, of men who live under the control and protection of the God who delivered their fathers. They are identified with the men of that great past because they have received and are to perpetuate its tradition and its truth. And so, when the writer says at the conclusion of his beautiful and expressive ritual, 'Thou hast avouched the Lord this day to be thy God' (xxvi. 17 f.), he is filled with the sense of how each worshipper is the member of a nation that lives under the one eternal covenant. Each act of its organic life in its worship is the act of men who thus take up and serve themselves heirs to their past. Above all, each act in which a man in Israel shows himself conscious of God's mercy to him and of God's will for him is something in which he avouches himself anew the heir of the life that has sustained all his nation's history. A little deed of ritual renews the sense of their organic life, and expresses afresh their historic identity and their corporate unity. And it expresses this through their sense of serving the will of Him who is the eternal God.

I think every Christian man knows that sense in the

Holy Communion, and the power of a simple ritual in which something is done which has only been done by men who own a common faith. I think every Christian man understands the significance of the prayer in the Fourth Gospel: 'Neither pray I for these alone, but for those who shall believe on Me through their word.' The Church, in a symbolic act of its corporate life, feels the centuries vanish in the presence of something which God has done for men, and serves itself heir to a life which is not of to-day nor of yesterday, for it has been in all the generations which have done this in remembrance, and shall be in all the generations which do it to the end.

The intensity of the conception of the people as an organism, the pulse of whose corporate life is a united and conscious effort to fulfil God's will, appears most clearly in ch. iv.[29] There the people are represented as having received their historic life through an act of God. But the life which has come from Him has been called into existence to fulfil His purpose. The people therefore receive directly from the God who has created them the ten words which express His will for them. Moses, God's representative among them, receives order to give the commandment which issues from the law men have heard and from the relation to God it implies (vers. 13 f.). The final source of all their life as a community is the will of their God,[30] and the final rule of all their conduct is His will. Their God, the source of their national life and the giver of their land, is also the source and guardian of their law. And even as His first act as the Creator of their national life was to bring them where they might hear and accept the ten words of the law and acknowledge their obligations to fulfil the law, so the constantly repeated motive in the book is that the life and success of the nation in the land of Jahveh's gift are bound up with

the observance of His law. No one is exempt from this obligation. The king, who has hitherto been a difficult element in the national life and a disturbing influence in its religion, must be a member of the nation which is conscious of this purpose (xvii. 15), and in his relation to the law he is but another subject who is definitely bound to its observance (xvii. 19).[31]

Now the nation, when it loyally fulfils its side of the covenant, and when it has thus become the fitting instrument for serving Jahveh's purpose in the world, can rely on Jahveh to fulfil the promise which is implied in His initial deed on its behalf. He who, after He made it a nation, gave it a land in which His will might be done, will guarantee it still the necessary conditions for doing His work. This is the explanation of the Deuteronomic rules for war—both of their presence in the book and their character. They presuppose a nation which is quick to learn and patient to observe all its God's will. Out of a people which has taken this attitude comes the army which is its temporary instrument for a particular purpose. But, when such preliminary requirements have been fulfilled, Israel can expect the protection of Him whose will it has prepared itself to do. For the nations to be at enmity with Israel brings with it in the event of war a sure overthrow (xx. 4, 13, xxi. 10, xxiii. 15, xxviii. 7; cf. also vi. 19).[32]

Since the victory is in God's hands and He guarantees deliverance from their enemies, the Deuteronomic regulations as to war in ch. xx. and ch. xxiii. are not so much regulations as to the right method of conducting warlike operations as they are the means of retaining Jahveh in the midst of a camp to which He then makes victory sure (cf. i. 42). When the warriors are met together, and before the officers have done anything to order the array, the priest is to make

proclamation as to the certainty of Jahveh's support. The camp must then be purged of all who have insufficient faith in the divine support, and who are therefore unfit instruments for the war. After this all who are newly married or who have made a recent purchase of oliveyard or vineyard must be sent nome. Either their minds are too greatly possessed by worldly affairs, or they have other commissions from God to execute: in either case, they too are not thought capable of doing this work for God's service in Israel. Then, and only then, when the warriors are made such as Jahveh will use for His ends, because they absolutely rely on His help, can the officers proceed to their subordinate business of discipline (xx. 1–9). When the men are in camp, they must carefully remove from their tents everything which is and everyone who is ritually unclean (xxiii. 10–15). That the motive which underlies this is not hygienic, as we are apt to think, is proved no less by the fact that the man who has been troubled by nocturnal emissions is put outside the camp till he has been ritually purged, than by the definite statement that through retaining any ritual uncleanness the warriors may offend the eyes of Jahveh, who walketh in their camp. The purpose of it all is to keep Him whose presence guarantees their instant victory.

Further, the war itself must be conducted on methods and for aims which are approved by Jahveh. While they are actually engaged in war, they shall not cut down the fruit-bearing trees, God's gifts to His creatures (xx. 19 f.). After their victory has been won, they shall employ it in such fashion as to serve the interests of the faith. They may keep the booty, including the women and children, of all cities which are distant from them (xx. 10–15), but, when the cities are Canaanite cities and their continued existence would form a peril to the religion, they must put them

under the ban (xx. 16–18). For it was Jahveh's intention to root out these cities utterly (i. 28–30, ii. 12, 24, iii. 6, 21 f., iv. 38, vii. 1–4, 16–24, viii. 20, ix. 1–5, xi. 23–25, xii. 30, xviii. 12, xix. 1, xx. 16–18, xxxi. 3–6). To suffer them to continue would be to sin against Jahveh (xx. 18). The victory which Jahveh gives must be employed for Jahveh's ends.

Everything here is regarded, not from the point of view of practical warfare, but from the point of view of religious dogma.[33] Behind the legislation lies the theologumenon: 'The Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, to deliver thee, and to give up thine enemies before thee' (xxiii. 15). Jahveh uses Israel as His instrument to do His work; and all for which Israel need provide is to make itself a fitting instrument for this work. The warriors, their camp, their methods of war, their uses of victory must be such as satisfy Jahveh's claims; thereafter He will give them victory.[34]

What we have in such a theory—for it is a religious theory—is the construction which was put upon the teaching of Isaiah, especially when that teaching had, as its historic sequel, the amazing deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib. The Deuteronomists, in their own way and with their own misunderstanding of its central conviction, were seeking to express Isaiah's doctrine of how the first business of the nation was to obey Jahveh's will and leave Him to secure the place and the conditions in which that will was to be done. No doubt the Deuteronomists were a little ready, as in truth we are all a little ready, to define the conditions which they counted necessary for the full discharge of their divinely appointed duty, and to take it for granted that what they believed to be thus necessary must equally appear necessary to the Almighty. We all claim our necessary conditions, as though we knew

all the purpose of God and the only means for its adequate fulfilment. It needed the defeat under Josiah at Megiddo and the exile to teach Israel, and especially the Deuteronomists, that men have not to dictate to their God the conditions of life which they count necessary, but to accept those which He Himself lays down for them and serve Him there.

But, when one has recognised all such difficulties, and when one further acknowledges how grievously the reformers failed to grasp the essential thought of Isaiah, there remains the great conception of a nation which is filled throughout with the sense that it has its own character to preserve and its own work to fulfil, and which is more interested in these things than in asserting its place in the world. The latter concern it leaves to the unseen Providence who governs all our outward fate; the former it turns to consider with its whole heart. And, apart from any view we may have of the intervention of Providence in this world for the preservation of the men who seek to fulfil His will, we do know that those are most likely to find the conditions practicable and tolerable who realise that they have a mission to fulfil in any conditions and a duty to do whatever their circumstances may be. Perhaps the world has seen more than enough of institutions which are so eager about suitable means for doing their work that they forget the work itself which it is theirs to fulfil in any conditions and by any means.

But the certainty and completeness of the divine protection, in which Jahveh fulfils His covenant with His people, rest on the willingness of Israel to fulfil its side. The covenant is mutual, and Israel must perform what its God requires. One part of the obligation has been already dwelt on —namely, how it implies the recognition of Jahveh alone and the safeguarding of the cult from all recognition of other gods.

But this is not the major part of what Jahveh requires. His nature has been revealed in His great act of love to His people: He is One who loveth justice and dealeth justly. The recognition of Him as their God must include justice in men's relations to one another, and above all mercy.

I say above all mercy towards their fellow-Israelites, because it is here that Deuteronomy shows itself to have imbibed the teaching of Hosea, as supplementary to that of Amos. As thoroughly as Amos, the book recognises the revealed will of God as the norm of all the people's conduct and the test of its obedience. There is but one rule, the will of God. But the sense of Jahveh as prescribing His law from without and as coming from without to test the people's obedience is softened at every point. His will is rather the mainspring of the people's life. Men in Israel cannot recognise what they are without knowing what He has done for them. The thought of their common life is indissolubly united with the remembrance of His work and His will. They are regarded as free and able to do all He requires; but what He requires is always insisted on as their good, and so the requirement loses its harshness as a demand and is conceived of as a guide and support. Where they fail, they may hope in His compassion, for their experience in the desert has proved how the broken threads of the national life can be re-knit on their repentance. All these are elements taken over from Hosea and powerfully used as motives for making the nation realise itself as set in the world to fulfil an end which expresses itself in the social life and its forms.

Further, the cult is recognised as the means for quickening that dependence on Jahveh and that gratitude to Him for His benefits which are the most potent means for purifying their social life. But it is being already recognised as not so much an end in itself.

The Deuteronomic legislation as to sacrifice was sure to result in a diminution of its amount and in a lessening of its importance. When the law of the one sanctuary was enforced, it inevitably brought with it that the local rites and festivals which had hitherto bulked so largely in the life of the people, and which so greatly represented their religious life, were either brought to an end or took on a new non-religious character. When the harvest festivals, instead of being celebrated in connection with the returning seasons and at the local centres, were celebrated at Jerusalem and supplied with new motives, the local celebrations came to have an altered meaning and specially lost their religious reference. One cannot doubt that the Israelites continued to have harvest festivals and to make merry at their sheep-shearings—no legislation has ever altered or will ever alter the natural inclinations of men in the turn of a hand. Only the people took part in these celebrations without the religious practices which had once attached themselves to them. It is frequently said that, when the reformers made this change, they made a severance, even an unhappy severance, between the secular and the religious life of the nation. Perhaps the men who say these things forget or have never known how little of religion there is apt to be in junketings to which a holy character is imputed by the practice of little perfunctory rites, the very meaning of which has been long forgotten. Apart, however, from the fact that the reformers were glad to see these things go because of their connection with the Baal rites, one may venture to say they were content to see such services diminished in number. For to them these were not the real means through which Jahveh was honoured; and their existence had inevitably tended to make Israel think they were.

But more suggestive than anything else of the relative

position the reformers ascribed to the ritualistic practices which they retained or commanded and the social righteousness which they also regarded as the will of Jahveh is the fact that they so frequently base the observance of the ritual on motives taken from humane considerations. Deuteronomy, *e.g.*, orders the one-day rest in seven, and insists on it, not as something based on Jahveh's action at creation, but as based on Israel's own experience of an unbroken week of toil (v. 12–15). It is a precarious inference to conclude that the story of creation was unknown to the writer, and that he was therefore unable to use the motive taken from Jahveh's rest on the seventh day. Even if he had known the story, it is doubtful whether he would have used it. The fact that Deuteronomy uses the one motive and the Priestly Code uses the other shows the different attitude of the two codes. The cult to Deuteronomy has an ultimate end in the quickening of devotion to God and in so making a nation which is eager to do His will. To see the end for which the cult is there is of more importance to the authors than merely to prescribe it as an arbitrary order from Jahveh.[35]

When men offer their thanksgiving to Jahveh for an abundant harvest or a plentiful vintage (xii. 12, 18, xvi. 11, 14), it is as important to share the fruits with the poor as to present them before Jahveh. In the ritual concerning the firstfruits nothing is said about the amount which is to be laid on the altar, but the amount to be given to the poor is stated to be the tithe (xxvi. 2, 12). That is the conception of the prophets as to religion. Jahveh does not claim much for Himself except a grateful and obedient heart, and accepts the offerings as the evidence of that gratitude. He regards as a true act of piety the fulfilment of the claims which a fellow-Israelite urges on the compassion of the worshipper.[36]

Where anything enters that may imperil the faith, the punishments are severe and unhesitating. No ties of nationality (xiii. 12–18), no bond of blood (6–11), shall prevent the people from inflicting the last penalty on anyone who would turn them from Jahveh. But, where the men are thought of as seeking together to serve their God's will, they are also conceived as forming one household.

There breathes through the book a tone of singular tenderness and respect for those who are fellow-Israelites; and, while this attitude is claimed in a positive command, it is also taken for granted as natural. A man is thought of as needing to harden his heart if he has no compassion on his needy neighbour; his first instinct is to have and to exercise compassion. So native to men in Israel is God's will for them.

In all this Deuteronomy was seeking to fulfil the work of the prophets. The prophets had brought into constant prominence how the divine grace to Israel involved certain demands and how these demands were for social righteousness, rather than for more frequent offerings. They had urged a conversion of the people, but had left vague what the converted people were to do. To help forward a complete reformation, the reformers sought to state in definite and easily grasped laws what exactly constituted the content of Jahveh's claims. Hence the Deuteronomists set the general statement of the decalogue in the foreground, as the foundation and the norm for all other legislation. In chs. v.–xi. they developed and emphasised the truths of the divine spirituality and of the intimate relation between Jahveh and Israel which were contained in the first three commandments. In chs. xii.–xxvi. they sought to modify the legislation which already governed Israel's life, in order to safeguard these truths, and in order to develop the laws as to men's bearing

to each other, which were contained in the later rules of the decalogue. They were carrying on the work of the prophets in thus applying great principles, which they believed to form the foundation of a true reformation, but which seemed too vague and distant from actual life to be easily grasped by the nation whose good they sought. The law they thus emphasised was not meant as an opposition but a supplement and application of the work of the prophets. The laws as to the cult were meant to safeguard the uniqueness of the character of Jahveh, in whose name the prophets spoke. The laws as to social conduct were the development of principles on which the prophets had insisted as having their foundation in the divine will.

V.

But Deuteronomy shows itself also under the influence of the prophets in several attempts at social legislation which represented a conservative reaction and an effort to preserve conditions which were inevitably passing away. We have seen already how the prophets represent the element in Israelite society which clung to the old, because it stood for a moral order, and, instead of always seeking to reach a new moral basis for the new conditions, hankered after a condition which could not return.[37]

It is impossible to enter into this question in full detail, but it is necessary to show its influence. When Deuteronomy, *e.g.*, forbids the removal of a neighbour's landmark (xix. 14), it is seeking to maintain the old communal life with its basis in the perpetual possession of the land by one family. Now that life, with all it implied, was doomed. Even if there had been no conquests by the foreigner to sweep away the native owners of land, the rise of trade in the

towns would have made such a regulation futile. When some men are eager to buy, and the owners as eager to sell, no law will prevent land from changing hands. Then the commune must give place to the state.

The most interesting and instructive illustration, however, is to be found in the law against usury (xxiii. 20 f.). In the old communal life of Israel, when the country was self-centred and its trade was of the meagrest, borrowing was only resorted to in case of real need. A villager might find himself through God's visitation in temporary necessity, or might need an advance of money to give a dowry to his daughter or to meet the expenses of his father's funeral.[38] In such circumstances, a loan was the means by which he was enabled to fulfil his obligations as a citizen. To advance a needy man money was, for a wealthier fellow-citizen in the little commune, an act of brotherhood, an acknowledgment of a common relation to each other and to God: to exact usury in those circumstances put the act outside of such considerations. From this point of view Deuteronomy regards all lending of money; and from this point of view one sees not only the delicacy, but the full meaning, of the command that the creditor shall not go into the debtor's house to take a pledge (xxiv. 10–13). His loan is meant to maintain the other's self-respect; and the very way in which he makes the required advance shall not hurt his brother-man's self-respect.[39]

But it is obvious that, as soon as the communal life was broken up, the old relation of debtor and creditor could not endure, and indeed ought not to endure. So soon as men wanted money on loan, not in order to enable them to fulfil their duties to the community but in order to make more money with it, the situation as between debtor and creditor was put outside the old relations. The men who borrowed money

for such purposes, and were able to borrow it without interest because the law forbade usury, were simply enabled by their religion to exploit the generosity of their neighbours. The inevitable result was that the law became a dead letter, for, so soon as there were men who were willing to give interest in the hope of making more, and other men who had money to lend, there were all the materials present for explaining away the law.[40]

The Deuteronomists failed to see that the old conditions had wholly passed away and that the new condition which had come to light demanded a fresh casting back on principles which were to be applied in the new condition instead of a reinforcement of rules which were equitable only in the old state of affairs. The legislators did not show themselves alive to the full breadth and difficulty of the situation. They were in a position when Israel needed, because of the change in its outward and inward situation, a legislation which faced all the facts, and so made possible a morality which could guide men in view of them. Deuteronomy was content to enforce rules which were a guide in conditions that were rapidly vanishing, and to cling to forms of morality which could no longer contain and support the enlarging life of the nation.

The strength of Deuteronomy does not lie here, but in its recognition of that which gave weight to the older customs and dignity to the earlier conditions. The reformers recognised and emphasised how a nation, which was made up of self-seeking men who owned no authority and felt no community of life with their fellows, was not a nation but a congeries of atoms. They held by the old because it represented a life that recognised and had found a moral basis. And even in clinging to the forms of that old life, and so imperilling the real growth of the State, they warned

men that they lost much when they lost the sense of a nation which had a common aim and with a common aim ultimate moral sanctions.

What preserved the Deuteronomic legislation from becoming a mere conservative reaction was that it recognised the unity of the nation in its traditions of God's grace, in its common worship of Him who was still gracious, and in the mutual duties which sprang out of these. There was a body of men in Israel who represented no more than a conservative reaction, the Rechabites. So far as we can see, these men held by the old because it was old, and consequently repudiated the new civilisation which was growing up in Palestine. For a little time they were in alliance with the prophets, who partly represented such a reaction; but the two, who had formed an accidental alliance for a single purpose in Ahab's time, soon parted company. The Rechabites had no definite positive principle which could build up a new habit of devotion and morality. And so, with the legislation of Deuteronomy, we practically hear no more of the Rechabites.[41] They vanished from Israel's religion, as men must do who represent no more than the past when a movement which can preserve the best of the past for the uses of the future, and is not therefore afraid of the future, takes possession of the life of a nation. So far as the question between it and the Rechabites was concerned, Deuteronomy, because of the positive elements in its thought of God and of men's relations to each other through their common relation to God, held the future.

VI.

It does not fall within the scope of a series of lectures which seeks to deal with the religious development of the

Hebrews under the kingdom to offer a thorough criticism of the work of the Deuteronomists. To understand adequately the movement they originated—and only on a clear understanding can a thorough criticism be based—a student must see its results for good and for evil, and must seek to recognise all it called forth, both in the men who continued it and in those who reacted against it. Even to begin such a task, it would be necessary to determine, and to give reasons for so determining, the attitude Jeremiah took to the Deuteronomic school. As is well known, opinions differ on the question whether the first great prophet, who arose after Deuteronomy, continued or reacted against its influence. Then, if it could be proved, as I believe it can, that Jeremiah's life-work is best understood as the effort to insist upon principles which were and are essential to true religion, but which the reformers had neglected, it would be necessary to trace, in Jeremiah the reaction against, in Ezekiel the continuation of, their work.

Yet, while it is true that only the later period makes clear the inevitable outcome of the principles on which the reformers worked, and thereby helps us to see the principles themselves, and that a criticism which cannot take full account of the development runs the risk of being premature, it is equally true that the work of the three preceding prophets supplies a criterion for judging the law-book, and that the law-book must be tested by whether it succeeded in giving due weight to the truths concerning what constituted true religion which the inspired leaders of Israel had seen and declared. And, since there can be no question as to Jeremiah being the next in the great line of prophetic inspiration, it is equally true that, only when we seek to measure how far Deuteronomy represents Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, can we hope to find the means of deciding Jeremiah's

attitude to the law. There is the greater reason for submitting Deuteronomy to such a test, because it was the amount of the prophetic teaching which its authors had made their own, and the fearless way in which they had removed practices abhorrent to the prophets, that made their work a reform at all and lent it its indubitable power. Their merits were very great, and their influence lasting—it is, for example, singularly suggestive to notice how frequently the Lord quoted from Deuteronomy. Their merits and their influence sprang from the prophetic teaching, which they had first assimilated and were seeking to bring within the reach of common men in Israel. If the prophets had not preceded them, they would never have had the insight to see their nation's need or faith enough to seek to satisfy its need.

It must, however, be added that they failed to grasp the commanding thought of Amos, Hosea and Isaiah; and, because they so failed, they only perpetuated in a subtler form the conflict of principles and ferment of irreconcilable convictions, which had called for the appearance of the prophets and had made their work a necessity for purifying the religion of Israel. Because this is the case, it is not unjust to borrow a sentence from the late Dr. Davidson's lectures to his class and say that Deuteronomy and Pharisaism were born into the world together.

The fundamental error of the Deuteronomists, the πρῶτον ψεῦδος running through and tainting all their work, was that they saw nothing higher than a national religion. Amos had seen Jahveh as holding a relation to man as man, and had conceived the relation of Jahveh to Israel and to the prophet in Israel as the culmination of an initial and fundamental relation. He had declared that Jahveh must intervene to manifest the basis of the world-order, and that the first

result of the day of the Lord should be to sweep away all the national life of Israel which had failed to fulfil its allotted function. In the consummation, men, no longer Israelites but men, should repent and find their place with Jahveh on that simple condition. Hosea had seen how religion demanded self-surrender, no more and no less, and had predicted the disappearance of every profaned form in the nation's life, because no one of them revealed such self-surrender, when Jahveh arose to make manifest how simple and how searching was His requirement. In the consummation nothing was needed except the love of God with the answering love of man. Isaiah had given up empirical Judah, and proclaimed how Jahveh was laying in Zion a new foundation, the communion of the souls who trusted in Him for everything. The men who had faith, and only they, had endurance and all the promise of the future. All the prophets had agreed in the prediction that Jahveh was about to intervene in order to create a new order, or to reveal the old order—to them it was the same, because Jahveh's was the eternal order. They had defined the relation of men to the new order when it came with varying degrees of clearness; but all had agreed that, before it came, the national life must pass away, and that after it came, the national life need not be restored. Now the Deuteronomists, when they sought to reconstitute religion in Israel at the warning of the prophets, worked with the nation as their basis, not the faithful. In some form or other they made the people of Israel, as it was, an essential, because they founded everything upon it.

Hence Jahveh's intervention in the world has no meaning for them, save as a threat or a warning to hasten their work. The conception of the divine intervention, which runs through all the prophetic thought, stood for the truth

that the world was one in a common divine purpose. Jahveh came to the world, because it was His. He could not fail to be concerned with it all. But the only form in which that great thought appears in Deuteronomy is that the God of Judah is also the God of the whole earth. Jahveh, the God whom Israel has known and to whom it owes everything, is conceived as the universal God. The Deuteronomists are stout monotheists; after their day no other doctrine on the nature of God will ever lay real hold on the higher religious thinkers of Israel. But they are inclined to think with humble and glad satisfaction that the God of their nation is also the God who controls and guides all things, and so thinking, they are inclined to carry up into the government of the universe the regulations of Judah. Certainly all these regulations need to be purified and safeguarded, but it is sufficient to purify and safeguard them. What men have done in Judah has a certain a priori right, after being duly purified, to be made of the essence of religion. The prophets would have altered the initial statement, and with the change have brought in a different emphasis and atmosphere. To them the God of the world was the God of Judah. Therefore religious men may not require, dare not require, anything more in Judah than what God requires of man. They must widen their faith to recognise that God can have a relation to all men, and must widen their forms of religion into something which can hold mankind. They may not venture to demand anything except what all men are required to offer, a true and living morality, a surrendered heart and faith. Deuteronomy is as sure as any prophet that Jahveh is alone, and construes His power as greatly as ever a prophet could: but it always returns to construe His power as demanding from men an obedience to the regulations Judah is prepared to obey.

Accordingly, the Deuteronomists took over some of the rites of the purely national worship, such as the passover and the tithes. They were careful to purge all the rites they took over from every element which brought into them an association with heathenism. They were diligent to prescribe where the rites should be performed and after what forms they should be observed. They provided some with motives taken from the history of Jahveh's dealings with His people, and restricted all to Jahveh alone, insisting that they should be carried out at His altar and on His holy days. But, however the rites were safeguarded and purified, they had their final justification in the fact that they were forms of Israel's worship, and had their real roots in thoughts of Jahveh and His relation to human life which were wholly alien to the prophetic thought. They were allowed to continue in a purified form, because they were already there. The weakness of the position is seen most clearly in the rules as to war (described on p. 220). It is impossible to conceive any of the prophets either formulating or tolerating customs which embodied so external a method of retaining Jahveh within the camp. Prophecy had made the ark of Jahveh unnecessary by breaking with an external guarantee of His presence. The importance assigned to a casual and natural pollution proves how the reformers either were only able, or were content, to sprinkle with holy water customs and rites which were deeply embedded in the habits of the people, but which had no point of essential connection with the prophetic religion and can have no place in a universal faith. It is true that Deuteronomy shows very few cases of the kind; but, when once the door was opened, many similar practices slipped in. A great mass of ancient ceremonial and formal ritual began forthwith to find its way back. Rites which had been practised at the early shrines, and were still dear to the

hearts of the worshippers, quietly returned. They were all altered more or less. It was forbidden to celebrate them at any other than the one shrine, or with other than the one intention. They were stripped of their grosser forms. All of them had a connection with the nation's past, and were dear to men who had long practised them. They could still, it was thought, be used, with slight modifications, with fresh interpretations, and above all with adequate safeguards, in the reformed worship of Israel. One cannot but recognise that the prophets would have regarded them all from a different standpoint. These rites, they would have said, have no vital connection with human life, as God desires man's life to be. They have no real roots in the conception of the relation between God and man, which all the prophets had exulted to enjoy and to reveal.

Only when the influence of Deuteronomy with this bent arising from its fundamental failure to grasp the essence of the prophetic thought is thus recognised can it be understood why the code, despite its real effort to purify the popular worship after prophetic ideals, was immediately followed by the great development of ritual prescription. Deuteronomy, through its interpretation of what is allowable and necessary in worship, stimulated the movement, which is represented by Ezekiel and the authors of the Priestly Code.

Even the break which the reformers made with the nature-festivals as nature-festivals, and their effort to supply motives drawn from the historic past of their nation and Jahveh's grace to it, tended in the same direction. The reason, as the justification, for the step was that thereby the festivals were separated from the association with Baal-worship and from the customs which ascribed the land and its gifts to Baal. Without doubt, the harvest and sheep-shearing must have been celebrated in a sufficiently lewd way. Yet the

thought these rites dimly expressed was no mean thought. The God who openeth His hand and satisfieth the desire of every living thing, to whom the young lions cry when they suffer hunger, is a great God. That the need of the world is its first prayer—a prayer which does not go unheard—is a wide thought. The Deuteronomists had no real hospitality for such thoughts. Once, it is true, they showed that something akin had touched them. They prescribed in xxvi. 1–11 a wholly new act of ritual, and connected it with the first-fruits. They added that every man in Israel, who brought his thanksgiving, should own himself akin to Abraham, a wandering stranger, whom Jahveh blessed with the knowledge of Him who had given him everything. The little ritual has a wide and human reference. So it could not stand against the trend of the rest of the code. It never struck deep roots in Israel's life, and at a later date, when the influence of the code had made itself felt, was quietly dropped. So far as I know, it was the only part of the Law which was ever dropped.

To the Deuteronomists all were Israel who were of Israel. They sought to build up a reformed and new society in Judah. They sought nobly to provide it with a divine sanction and a mutual bond, so that men might know themselves interdependent and all-dependent on their supreme Creator and Lawgiver. But the new foundation they laid in Zion consisted of the men who were circumcised, and who were willing to submit to the outward regulations of a faith their leaders had laboured so patiently to define. In taking that position, it has been already pointed out how they ran counter to the fundamental contention of the prophets whom they were endeavouring to obey. The prophets were leading men out to the position of a world-faith, because they required no more than what

they knew, through God's presence with them, to be essential to true religion. Deuteronomy went back to a national faith, for the basis of their future was laid in Israel, as it was.

It only remains to suggest how the basis, on which the new order was founded in Jerusalem, explains the attitude towards it of the great prophet, who had watched the work of the reformers. Before the results involved in their position had revealed themselves in their full development, Jeremiah, with the sure insight of prophetic inspiration, went straight to their false foundation. He too said that Jahveh was about to intervene in the world and to lay bare what was of eternal validity. When He came, He would enter into a new covenant with His people. The new society, which was to enshrine the relation of God to man and to build up the new order in obedience to its God, was to consist of the men who were circumcised in heart. The basis for the divine and enduring life was not the accident of having been born into Judaism: it was the birth into faith and a new obedience. All the order men were painfully rebuilding in Jerusalem was worthless, nay, it was noxious, because it was hiding from their eyes what was of true significance. When Jahveh intervened, He must sweep it away, because it rested on an accident, which had no value to the Ruler of the world.

Jeremiah was more strongly opposed to the State than any of his predecessors, because the work of the Deuteronomists had lodged the State in religion and had made it seem essential to the existence of religion. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that the responsible men in the capital, who had accepted the ideals of Deuteronomy, felt instinctively, even before the prophet had clearly formulated his expectation of the future, that he was disloyal to the existing

commonwealth. Men's instincts are often amazingly shrewd. He was radically disloyal to the fundamental principles on which the men of his time were painfully hoping to build up their new state. They believed that, through giving it the sanctions of religion, they were making it such as must guarantee the protection of their God. He, on the other hand, declared that all their action was serving to distort the nature of true religion and of real morality. When Jahveh intervened to manifest the reality, He must show how little worth preserving was their state. Jeremiah's attitude was much more radical than the mere declaration that nationality was indifferent in religion, for Deuteronomy, by making the nation the basis of religion, had made such an attitude on the part of a prophet impossible. Since men were pronouncing the nation an essential, he was compelled to say that they were making it a hindrance, and that the first act of Jahveh must be to remove the hindrance.

Jeremiah, therefore, sent his well-known letter to the captives in Babylon, bidding them cease to fret over the question of their exile and a possible return. Instead, they were to seek the peace of the country to which in God's providence they had been carried captive. The letter was no mere epistle of sympathetic interest, bidding men make the best of untoward circumstances and seek to accommodate themselves with a second-best. It was a religious pronouncement, a real part of the prophet's Gospel; and the men who preserved it among the prophetic writings showed their insight into its profound importance. Jerusalem, the holy land, the temple, the sacrifices were not essential to men who had faith in God; and the spoiled and captive faithful had the opportunity in Babylon to show how unessential they were by quietly doing without them all. They were to live under the alien sky, to which

in God's providence they had been consigned, and to prove that no loss of the outward forms of their nationality could make unreal the divine care and the divine guidance. They still kept everything which was essential to their religious life, since they had faith.

Men said at Jerusalem, 'The Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord are these.' They said it with a new fervour, since the Deuteronomists had purified the Temple and had glorified all its services. To all who favoured the reform and accepted it as final, the Temple was sure to seem an essential, not because it was the one place of lawful sacrifice and they could not conceive religion without sacrifice, but because it was the centre of the national worship, and they had made the basis of the religion they so greatly served the circumcised nation. Jeremiah counts no form of the national life an essential; he has no care for the Temple; like Hosea, he has no reference to the Messianic King. He is compelled to attack every form of the national life, because it has been made a means for distorting the essence of true religion. He founds his new society on what is universal, the circumcised heart.

NOTES.

CHAPTER I.

[1] Dr. Buchanan Gray, *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, pp. 259 f.

[2] Cf. *inter multos alios*, Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*; H. Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*; M. Gemoll, *Grundsteine zur Geschichte Israels*; B. Stade, *Geschichte Israels*.

[3] Cf., *e.g.*, J. Skinner, *Critical International Commentary on Genesis*; H. Gunkel, *Genesis* in the *Handkommentar*, and more recently and in more popular form, *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen*; Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*.

[4] This unity which marks the stories in their present form is the characteristic on which Dr. Orr in his *Problem of the Old Testament* has laid a deserved emphasis.

[5] This is the characteristic of the editors which Gunkel singles out as their prime virtue, *Komm. zu Genesis*, pp. lviii f. He has modified this position in *Die Urgeschichte etc.*, pp. 7 f., but does not seem to go far enough in recognising the plastic power of the editors in selecting and remoulding their material. When he says, *e.g.*, very truly, "Der Grundgedanke der ihnen vorschwebte war: darzustellen wie Israel, aus den Völkern erwählt, aus Ägypten erlöst, mit dem Jahvegesetz beschenkt, und dann nach Kanaan geführt worden ist: dies Volk ist Jahves Eigentum, Stätte seines Gesetzes, durch ihn Kanaans Herr," he has admitted as to outward form what must carry conviction as to inward principles. For this implies in the writers some recognition of what distinguished Israel from the nations, of the power of Jahveh who could redeem from Egypt, of what constituted the Jahveh law; and these inward principles must not only have governed the choice of the tales but have modified the form in which they were presented.

CHAPTER II.

[1] Contrast how Daniel and the Hebrew children are held up for commendation because of their loyalty to the outward observances of their religion.

[2] Stade, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, p. 52; cf. also Stade in *ZATW* vi. 303.

[3] It deserves note that the two places where the writer is most careful to mark that Jahveh is more than the *numen loci*, Bethel and Sinai, are the two places which were most apt to suggest the opposite conception. In particular Bethel was the centre of a cult which had a local limitation.

[4] This may seem too strongly stated in view of the way in which J introduces the story of Abraham by the series of stories of the Creation of man, the Paradise, the Flood, the Tower of Babel. Here Jahveh is viewed as having a relation to man as man, and to the world as a whole. But, on the other hand, it is remarkable how in these stories there is a different spirit from that which characterises J's other tales. The conception of God is anthropomorphic to a degree which is remarkable in any circumstances, but which is peculiarly remarkable when it is contrasted with the conception which pervades the series of stories combined in the Joseph-cycle. The pessimism also which has often been noted in the stories, the sense, not of man's fugitive life, but of his degradation and debasement, is very different from the sense of how man does his work in happy reliance on the divine help which pervades the stories of the lives of the patriarchs. One is forced to the conclusion that, while these traditions have been taken over, because they were not inconsistent with the general tendency of the rest of the work, they do not represent the deeper thoughts of the editors; and one can only conclude that these editors had not turned their own minds to the relation of Jahveh to the universe, since they were able to accept traditions which otherwise were so singularly divergent from their own point of view.

[5] Compare and contrast Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der Israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*, pp. 118 ff.

[6] Compare the discussion, from a very different point of view, in B. D. Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien*, ii. 29 ff.

[7] If it should be objected that this need mean no more than that Jahveh dwells at Sinai, but promises to come from His abode to

meet His worshipper, it needs to be remembered that at Sinai He is carefully represented as having come down.

[8] 'Retain,' because the use of the word חרב, sword, for a metal tool points to an earlier time at which the law was promulgated, a time before the people were settled in Canaan and had possessed themselves of chisel and hammer.

[9] When the patriarch promises to pay tithe at this place, it is not because this was the only place where it was lawful for him to pay tithe, it is because his return will prove that Jahveh has preserved him during his journey. For such a signal mercy a peculiar acknowledgment was due. The fact that the payment of Jacob's tithe at Bethel is made, not habitual, but the special recognition of a special grace, militates in my opinion against the idea that the story was meant to supply the foundation for the payment of regular tithes at Bethel. One does not base a regular custom on the fact that an ancestor practised this on one occasion and for a special reason. Besides, there is no ground for believing that the custom of the tithe was peculiar to Bethel: Amos iv. 4 f. speaks of it as though it were a common feature of the cult at Bethel and at Gilgal.

[10] It confirms this view to notice that, while E mentions the מצבת and their use, he is silent as to the אשרים. Evidently these latter emblems were felt by him to have a more purely heathen reference than the מצבת.

[11] It is only with this representation of the early religion that we are here concerned. That there were other elements in Israel's religion at this period which laid a stronger emphasis on sacrifice is more than probable.

[12] When Dr. Skinner (*Comm. on Genesis*, p. 1) says that after all an altar is of no use except for sacrifice, and that therefore J here recognises the worth of sacrifice, the retort is just against the position of Luther (Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, pp. 140 ff.), who holds that J polemises against altars and the whole sacrificial cult; but the remark fails to do so much justice to the attitude of J as is implied in Dr. Skinner's later statement on p. 246: "It is, however, a singular fact that in J there is no record of actual sacrifice by the patriarchs on such altars."

[13] The position taken in the Joseph-episode is the more convincing as to the attitude taken by its editor because it is evident that these stories have been more freely handled than, *e.g.*, the stories which had gathered round the names of Jacob and Moses. Dealing more

freely with his material, he has been able to show his own attitude more clearly.

[14] The difference in this respect between the two accounts agrees with the view which makes E a native of Northern Israel. The Northern kingdom practised a cult which was less severely puritanic than that which prevailed in the South, and Hosea shows the sense on the part of a prophet of the danger which the use of semi-heathen emblems brought of assimilating the character of Jahveh to that of the Baalim.

[15] Dr. Skinner (*Comm. on Genesis*, p. 157) finds a propitiatory sacrifice in Noah's offering after he has left the ark. But the guilt of that generation was regarded as atoned for in its death: Noah alone had found grace in the eyes of Jahveh, vi. 8, and having discovered how great this grace was, he acknowledges it in his offering.

It is significant that Noah's sacrifice is one of the elements in which the Biblical account of the flood agrees with the Babylonian story. In that story there was a special reason for the sacrifice being propitiatory, because the majority of the gods were regarded as angry over any man having escaped from the flood. They had intended that the deluge should destroy humanity; and the one man who has escaped from the calamity through the help of Ea offers a sacrifice to propitiate the anger of the other gods. The Hebrew account makes Noah's escape due to the divine mercy, and so transforms the meaning of the sacrifice. Hence it is not safe to press, as Dr. Skinner (*ad loc.*) does, viii. 21, and insist on the sweet-smelling smoke as implying propitiation.

It is equally significant as to where the Hebrew account lays the emphasis that the feature of the narrative which has found no parallel in the Babylonian stories is that which describes Jahveh as setting His bow in the clouds. The new race takes its point of departure from the divine mercy, and that mercy prompted the deliverance of Noah and gave him a new pledge of its continuance after he had escaped. Here, as in so much else in JE, the divine mercy is uncompelled.

[16] I say 'construed' because the rite appears to have had originally a very different meaning, and its present position seems deliberately chosen.

[17] In his view of this chapter, Gunkel greatly underestimates how the incident is related by E not of anyone in general, but of Abraham, the founder of the faith, and how it is told of a son on whom the

fortunes of this faith hung. Skinner also seems to lay too slight weight on this fact, which becomes more significant when one reads E's account consecutively. Recognising how E begins his whole story with Abraham and yet how little he has to say about Abraham, one realises that he must have had special reason for saying just this thing, that Jahveh who brought Abraham to Palestine refused to accept the sacrifice of his son.

Gunkel's further view, that the incident was once connected with a shrine at Jeru'el (which he reads instead of Moriah) in the vicinity of Tekoa in S. Judah, and was meant to bring out how child-sacrifice was not permitted there, seems peculiarly weak. One cannot but ask why E, the Northern historian, took so much interest in the customs of a shrine in the Judæan desert; and one asks this with greater wonder, when it is remembered that we have no other ground for believing that there ever was a shrine at this particular place.

See Procksch's discussion in *Das nord hebräische Sagenbuch*, p. 342.

[18] Because the sacrifice of Isaac is a מנחה, an offering of thanksgiving, I cannot agree with those who set the chapter late. There is no other period where it is appropriate. Stade (*Biblische Theologie des ATs.*, p. 244) refers it to the time of Manasseh. But we know from Mic. vi. 7 that men, probably at the period of Manasseh, brought such an offering as a propitiation. There is no hint of propitiation or of the need for it in Gen. xxii. The attitude as to sacrifice is so different that it is difficult to conceive what could induce a later commentator to insert a chapter which did not meet the situation.

Further, when Stade, referring to Von Gall (*Alt Israelitische Kultstätten*, pp. 112 ff.), states that the chapter was directed against the practice of child-sacrifice which characterised the cult of a high place at Sichem, he makes the date of Manasseh's reign for the chapter much more difficult. In the period of Manasseh the high place at Sichem must have been swept away with the fall of Northern Israel, and Von Gall's airy dismissal of this difficulty does not in the least meet it. If Mic. vi. 7 is to be trusted, the place of such sacrifices in Manasseh's reign was Jerusalem; and to represent it as forbidden at Sichem, which had then sunk into insignificance, seems a fantastic form of amusement, rather than practical legislation.

When one retains the early date of Gen. xxii., one understands better Jeremiah's attitude on the question of child-sacrifice. He refers to it several times, *e.g.* xix. 4 f., only to say quietly that

this never came into Jahveh's mind. It is as though he said to his compatriots that the question needs no discussion, for Israel is long past the position in which it was even conceivable that Jahveh could require such a thing.

[19] There may, of course, be present the other thought, that through the gift to Jahveh, especially of the firstfruits, men consecrate the whole, and so make of what is retained for their own use a permitted and pure employment. (Cf. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des ATs.*, p. 158.) But the substitution of the ram shows that this is at least not the dominant idea of the passage.

[20] Note the contempt with which the teraphim is treated in the story of Jacob's flight from Laban. It can be stolen, and stolen by a woman; and after she has stolen it, she sits upon it to conceal it, though she is in a condition of impurity which debarred any worshipper from access to holy things. Evidently the teraphim is not construed as presenting any danger to the faith.

[21] See *The Living Forces of the Gospel*, translated by Rev. N. Buchanan.

[22] Gunkel, *Komm. on Genesis*, p. L. See this whole passage, one of the finest pieces of work Gunkel has contributed on Genesis.

[23] Cf. also 1 Sam. xxiv. 20; 2 Sam. iii. 39.

[24] Read אֶל תִּגַּל instead of אֶל גַּיִל.

[25] Gressmann has drawn attention to some of these features in the account of JE, and speaking of them as though they were confined to Genesis, has insisted that they demand an explanation. I wholly agree with him that the naïveté of the stories is conscious and in a high degree artistic, and that this characteristic implies a singular degree of culture in the nation which could give them their present shape. But when he suggests (*Der Ursprung*, p. 129, note) that the stories were probably borrowed from the Canaanites and prove how the Canaanites were already so far advanced in culture that a touch of rationalism was beginning to steal over their earlier and cruder faith, I can see no support for the view. The character is not confined to the Genesis-stories, but is apparent also in Exodus; within Genesis it is most apparent in the Joseph-cycle. Now these are the stories which are most remote from the influence of Canaan and most closely concerned with the peculiar history of Israel. That is to say, this characteristic lies in the main stream of the religious thought of Israel. And when one notes further how it is the presence of these elements in Israel's early faith which makes the rise and influence of

Amos and Hosea explicable, one is forced to conclude that this was the peculiarly Israelite possession. What these facts seem to point to is that Israel was accurate when it said that the faith had a history long before the people came to Canaan, a history long enough to impress upon it its own peculiar character. These things make it necessary to recognise the tradition as to the life-work of Moses.

[26] See the discussion on Deuteronomy, p. 212, *infra.*

[27] Cf. C. G. Montefiore, *Hibbert Lecture*[2], pp. 64 ff.; W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*[2], pp. 100 ff.; Wellhausen, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*[6], pp. 28 f.; A. Loisy, *Religion of Israel*, pp. 127 f.

[28] Professor Oman has drawn my attention to an interesting parallel in Jusserand's *English Wayfaring Life in the Fourteenth Century.* Jusserand holds that the English habit of wandering to sanctuaries acted like the modern press in creating a general national sentiment, and so fostered a free national life very early. When one thinks thus of the sanctuaries and festivals in early Israel, one finds an additional reason why Amos made his appearance at Bethel, and why the royal official took fright at hearing this dangerous voice. See my view of the incident, p. 62, *infra.*

CHAPTER III.

[1] How powerful one can learn from the beautiful picture of Hannah in 1 Sam. chs. i. f.

[2] Winckler has a wise word of caution against too great readiness to conclude, from the existence of similar rites or similar laws in different nations, that one of these must have borrowed from the other. It is generally concluded, he says, that "if one finds two similar phenomena, the one must spring from the other. The carefully drilled philologist and the painstaking student never take into account that the vast majority of these significant phenomena (*Grössen*) have been lost to our knowledge. If two men look alike, they must always be father and son; the possibility that they are brothers is not reckoned with. All eggs are believed to spring one from the other" ("Arabisch Semitisch Orientalisch," in *MVAG*, 1901, p. 189).

[3] On the meaning of the word נביא see Stade, *Biblische Theologie des ATs.*, p. 132; and König, *Geschichte der ATlichen Religion*, p. 107. W. R. Smith, *Prophets*[2], p. 390, points out how it is likely that this was a loan-word, which dated from the time of the Hebrew

settlement in Canaan; but he emphasises how, if this is the case, the etymology of the word becomes comparatively unimportant. It may be added that, since according to 1 Sam. ix. 9 נביא came in to take the place of the older Hebrew word ראה as the title of the prophet, this makes it likely that the word, not the person with his peculiar functions whom the word described, was taken from the Canaanites. If it was only the word which was taken over from the foreigners, its etymology is comparatively negligible. When the later Hebrew writers, therefore, are able to speak of Moses as a prophet (Hos. xii. 14; cf. Deut. xxxiv. 10), and to describe Abraham as a prophet, the statement may be an anachronism, so far as the word is concerned. But in so describing the great founders of their faith, they do but say that the essential thing which lay in prophetism was latent in the religion from the beginning.

[4] Smend, *ATliche Religionsgeschichte*, p. 81, states that Samuel had nothing to do with the נביאים, and that the idea of a connection between him and them is only found in the later account of 1 Sam. xix. 18 f. But this ignores how, as soon as Samuel has anointed Saul, he predicts not only that Saul will meet a company of prophets, but that he will prophesy among them (x. 5 f.). After that, he is to do as his hand finds; but the connection between the national uprising and the נביאים is plain.

[5] From this point of view one must interpret the attitude of the Book of Judges. This speaks of the national heroes, who fought for Israel's independence, but who were by no means edifying examples of Israel's religion, as endowed with the Spirit of Jahveh: even so questionable a leader as Samson was a nazirite. The Spirit of Jahveh is regarded as resting on each leader of the national cause in order to equip him for this specific task, which was the first necessity for Israel and for the faith.

[6] Stade, *Biblische Theologie des ATs.*, p. 67, also held that the נביאים were not derived from Canaan. But, when he based this view largely on the fact that Amos regarded the prophet as a gift from Jahveh, he was on surer ground than when he used the presence of the Rechabites to prove the originality of the Hebrew prophecy. The alliance between the prophets and the Rechabites was too brief, and too much connected with one situation in N. Israel, to permit us to draw general conclusions as to their similarity of spirit.

[7] So the story of Samuel's childhood, 1 Sam. iii., represents the

first revelation to the boy as a revelation concerning the future of Eli's house. The account must be fairly early, for it connects revelation with dreams obtained by sleeping within the temple (vers. 1–3), yet it regards prophecy as involving some knowledge of Jahveh's action in the future, and, it may be added, connects this prediction as to the future with a judgment on the present.

[8] The exact quotation of Tatian's words makes the matter even more clear: τῶν ὅλων τὸ μοναρχικόν, *Oratio ad Graecos*, xxix. 7. He is describing his conversion.

[9] If בָּעֵת be retained in the text, compare for its use in the sense of 'at the right time' or 'at the due season' (R.V.), Ps. civ. 27. The true reading, however, may be בְּעִתּוֹ, *i.e.* at its time. For מַה פָּעַל read מַה יִפְעַל. This praise of Israel, as needing no enchantments to learn the will of its God, occurs alongside the praise of the people, as having 'the shout of a king' (ver. 21). The combination makes it likely that the passage dates from the early kingdom, when the nation was confident in its new sense of national power under its head, and in its quickened sense of being guided by those to whom God's will was made known. Contrast how in 1 Sam. iii. 1 it is said that the word of the Lord was rare in the days which preceded the kingdom. The whole incident of Balaam is singular and noteworthy, especially when it is recognised that the story dates from the period of the early kingdom. (Gressmann, *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung, ad loc.*, though he construes the shout of a king in a very different sense, allows that the story is of this early date.) For here all heathen necromancy is mocked at: the great sorcerer who has been brought at large expense to curse Israel cannot see what his she-ass can see; is only kept from destruction by the superior knowledge of his ass; and, when he does speak, can say no more than that which Jahveh allows him to say.

[10] It is instructive to notice that necromancy never struck firm roots in Israel, but existed only in corners, so long as prophecy, with its emphasis on the spirit of man as the medium of revelation, remained a living force in the nation. On the other hand, the Babylonian Talmud is tainted with this belief, and the Book of Tobit shows not only a strongly developed angelology, but a belief in magic among the Jews. Men still believed in the need and worth of learning their God's will, but they had ceased to believe that the sure means through which the divine will could be learned was the soul of a man.

[11] Stade, *Biblische Theologie des ATs.*, p. 129, noted the fact, but offered no explanation.

[12] Cf. A. B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 47. What ground Gressmann has for stating (*Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels*, p. 29) that "the account makes a sharp distinction between seers and prophets" I wholly fail to understand.

[13] I think Dibelius in *Die Lade Jahves* has proved that the ark was regarded as the throne of the invisible Jahveh. On this throne the God of Israel takes His seat, especially when the people are engaged in war. Thus in its early form it goes out at the head of the marching host (Num. x. 35), and Jahveh is invoked to rise up for His people against His enemies. As soon as Israel makes good its footing in the land, it appears at Shiloh (1 Sam. iii. 3; cf. i. 3), where the conquerors have asserted themselves. When the people try to make head against the Philistines who are threatening to possess themselves of the holy land, they turn back to that which had guaranteed their earliest victories (iv. 3). Its appearance in the camp seemed to make sure the presence of the conquering Jahveh among the Israelites; the Philistines are afraid of the God whose coming has put new courage into their enemies (iv. 7). The ark, therefore, is a specifically Israelite symbol, and is particularly the emblem of Jahveh of the hosts of Israel.

For another view of the ark than that of Jahveh's throne, see Kautzsch, *Biblische Theologie des AT.*, pp. 53 f. Kautzsch seems to me to lay too much stress on the meaning of *arōn* as a chest: after all, we can only gather what sense a nation attaches to a word from the way in which it uses the word; and, if this word is only used in the sense of throne, it is a precarious inference to say that it ought to have been used in some other sense because of its etymology and original meaning.

[14] Kraetzschmar, *Die Bundesvorstellung im AT.*, p. 215, says that "the ark, at the period when the time of rest for Israel arrived, disappeared from its position and vanished, never to reappear in the Temple." This fails to recognise the most significant point in the record, that the ark disappeared as a motive force long before the time of rest, indeed at the very period when Israel was at death-grips for its national existence with the Philistines. When it did reappear, it reappeared with all its influence gone, because the religion had found a new means of self-expression, which made the ark a mere accessory. Even David, who brought it into Jerusalem, thinks its

presence with him in his flight from Absalom superfluous, and sends it back to Jerusalem (2 Sam. xv. 23–29). The priests who bear it are of more value to him in the capital as spies than the ark would be, if it were retained in his camp.

[15] It deserves notice in passing that this is said, not of Elijah, but of Elisha: and Elisha is recognised even in the Books of Kings as occupying a lower plane than his predecessor.

[16] The writer of 1 Sam. xviii. 10 states that, when an evil spirit from Jahveh came upon Saul, the king prophesied. The natural conclusion is that the behaviour which attended the prophetic excitement was a matter of such indifference to him that he had no difficulty about ascribing it to an evil spirit from Jahveh.

[17] When the writer adds that Elijah girded himself and ran before Ahab's chariot, it is noteworthy that this is separated from the revelation, and so accentuates the more the serenity of the prophet's conduct when he acted as prophet. The act which was possible under the excitement of the moment is added as a mere accessory. The prophet's authority has been acknowledged and his message delivered before this act which accompanied its assertion.

[18] Cf. *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*[6], p. 112.

Cf. also Cornill, *Der Israelitische Prophetismus*[2], p. 135. The latest and extreme statement of this opinion is in C. F. Kent, *The Sermons, etc., of Israel's Prophets*, p. 10, who says: "It is noteworthy that a prophet never appeared in Israel's history unless there was some great national, social or moral need; and conversely, there was never a great crisis which did not call forth a prophet or prophetess."

[19] See the discussion, from a different point of view, in Giesebrecht, *Grundlinien für die Berufsbegabung der AT. Propheten* in *Greifswalder Studien*, pp. 49 f.

[20] Ahijah's prophecy has undergone a later revision, but this does not alter the evident truth that some of the prophets supported Jeroboam (1 Kings xi. 26 ff.).

[21] J. Morley, *Diderot*, vol. ii. p. 145.

[22] As Cheyne, *Introduction to Isaiah*, 1893, p. 5, expressed the situation: "the old morality based on the tribal and family relations was going out, and the new morality based on a sense of national unity was not yet fully come."

[23] Frequently the prophets appear as the purely conservative force in Israel, and defend old tribal customs which had no merit except that of being old. Thus Samuel appears as one who blames Saul

for not having fulfilled the ban on Agag (1 Sam. xv. 32 f.), and supports a custom against which the higher feeling of the nation was already revolting. Gad denounces the wrath of Jahveh on David for having taken a census and ignored in this fashion the ancient separate existence of the tribes (2 Sam. xxiv. 11). (Note how unwilling Joab, who is no devotee, is to undertake the task.) A great part of the support which Elijah received in his first opposition to Ahab arose from his having defended the right of the Israelite burgher to his ancestral land (1 Kings xxi.). But that the prophetic movement was no mere conservative opposition to the inevitable change which came over Israel when it passed from being a collection of tribes into a united monarchy, is shown by the way in which it continued to regard the kingdom, the outward evidence and means of this change, as a gift from Jahveh, and by the fact that it formulated its Messianic ideal in the shape of a King who shall rule in the spirit of Jahveh. Only those can regard the prophets as the opponents of all progress who construe progress as an increase of wealth and organisation, without regard for the ethical basis on which this progress is founded and the ends for which the wealth and centralised power are being used. That the prophets, in their insistence on the need for an ethical basis in the new condition of society, idealised the past and clung to some parts of the nation's past without sufficient warrant is only what may be expected from men in their position. But the wider elements in the movement prove that they clung to the past, not merely as something which they understood and loved, but as something which contained an ideal of the commonweal which was profoundly endangered by the rise of a lawless governing class.

[24] In connection with this incident, it is necessary to recognise that David is not condemned for the injury he has done to Bathsheba, or for the immorality, in the narrower modern usage of that word, which he has practised. The point of the parable of the ewe lamb was that David had taken possession of the wife, who was the property, of Uriah. This brings the incident into closer relation to Elijah's assault on Ahab for having outraged the rights of Naboth.

[25] The recognition of how prophecy from the beginning stood for a God, who was national, but whose purpose of righteousness the nation was in some measure called to serve, makes it easier to understand why prophecy flourished so greatly and sprang up so early in the Northern kingdom. There the elements which roused the prophet were present in their greatest force. The tribal customs which gave a

moral basis to the community were strongest in the kingdom which had rebelled against Solomon because he had interfered with them in the interests of the central power. The new disintegrating forces, which broke up this older morality but which failed to supply a law on the new basis of a widened morality, were also present in their strongest influence. The kingdom of Ephraim was, further, exposed to foreign influences in a way in which and to a degree to which the little inland state of Judah was not. The king of Israel *must* enter into some relation to the States by which he was closely environed. When the kingdom came into the hands of a powerful dynasty, such as the house of Omri, all these elements and new forces came to their full strength. Accordingly, it is under Ahab, the ablest ruler of that house, that prophecy came to its earliest and clearest self-expression.

[26] Cf., for the significance of Elijah, Wellhausen, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*[6], p. 76.

[27] 'Even': because it was less usual for women to bear names which were compounds of Jahveh.

[28] It would further appear that his religious attitude led to a recrudescence of Baal-worship among the people, for it is difficult to believe that the mere maintenance of a royal chapel for Baal could have produced so wide an apostasy as sprang up at this time. The prophets of Baal whom Jezebel supported account for the number of prophets with whom Elijah had to deal at Carmel; but it needs more than the personal entourage of the queen to account for the large number of Baal-worshippers whom Jehu butchered. It is not necessary to lay any stress on Elijah's statement that the nation had gone over wholly to Baal, because a man of strong and individual convictions is always apt to think that men who do not advance to positions which he sees to be involved in certain principles have abjured those principles themselves.

[29] *Inter alios*, A. B. Davidson, *The Called of God*, pp. 176 ff., takes the sound heard through the silence as the theophany to Elijah, and interprets this revelation in its contrast with the storm, earthquake, and fire as a condemnation of the methods followed by the prophet on Carmel. But the fire, earthquake, and storm are the theophany; and, when the voice interprets this to the prophet who is to make it the burden of his message to the people, it interprets what Elijah has witnessed as the continuation, not the reversal, of Elijah's method. There are to be three great catastrophes, corresponding with the fire, earthquake, and storm, which are to befall the nation.

What is meant by saying that Jahveh was not in the earthquake, etc., is that Jahveh was not embodied in these, but was the spiritual force behind them. Cf. Skinner, "Books of Kings" in the *Century Bible*, pp. 239 ff., and p. 74, *infra*.

[30] It is possible, as Guthe, *Geschichte Israels*, holds, that the detailed orders as to anointing Elisha, Jehu and Hazael did not originally stand in this place, for it was in connection with such statements that later writers were apt to make explicit in the light of later events what had originally been left vague. But, though a detailed statement may well have taken the place of a vaguer threat, the addition need not have altered the character of the statement. And, if the details are to be ascribed to a later hand, the fact that such a writer saw in the several calamities which afterwards befell the land the outcome of what had been revealed to Elijah, but goes to prove that the original formed a threat.

[31] This reason for locating Elijah's vision at Horeb seems more likely than the reason which Gressmann, *Der Ursprung etc.*, p. 99, offers —namely, that in Elijah's view Jahveh was only to be found at Horeb. Elijah had already received revelations in Palestine, and, in the authority which came from having received them, had confronted Ahab. In *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung*, pp. 269 f., Gressmann seems to have resiled from the idea that Jahveh in Elijah's view was only to be found at Horeb. He now acknowledges that the time of Moses was the ideal for Israel, and that Elijah, in going to Horeb, was consciously seeking to revive the ideas of Moses.

[32] Wellhausen[6], *ad loc. cit.*

CHAPTER IV.

[1] The saying with which his prophecy opens (i. 2) is of much too general a character, especially in the mouth of a prophet, and of much too isolated a character in the prophecy, to carry the conclusion that he who uttered it must have been a native of Judah. Amos called himself a herdman and a dresser of sycomore trees (vii. 14), and the place where he acted as a herdman is given as Tekoa (i. 1). Now "Tekoa is much too cold for sycomores to have ever grown there" (Driver, *Joel and Amos*, p. 208), and "the sycomore was formerly very plentiful, especially in the low lands" (G. E. Post, art. "Sycomore" in *DB*). It is likely that the prophet was a native of the Maritime Plain and a dresser of sycomores there, but that he also at

times found employment in the highlands of S. Judah. The clumsy phrase of the later introduction (i. 1), which describes him as 'among the herdmen of Tekoa,' seems to point to the fact that this was not his regular work, but the employment he was following when the inspiration of his life found him. If he came from the foothills on the borderland between Israel and Judah, this would make it more natural for him to realise the unity of the nation, and it would explain why Mount Carmel bulked so large in his imagination (i. 2, ix. 3).

[2] Read שְׁנַת for שֶׁבֶת, and compare for the parallels year and day Isa. xxxiv. 8, lxi. 2, lxiii. 4.

[3] W. R. Smith, *Prophets*[2], p. 82.

[4] Read, with Wellhausen, מִצְרַיִם for הָעֲרָבָה. My reason for accepting this change is that the description of the scope of the calamity occurs in a chapter which begins by announcing a woe to them that are at ease in Zion and to them that are secure in the mountain of Samaria (ver. 1), and which proceeds to declare how at Jahveh's command the great house shall be smitten with breaches and the little house with clefts (ver. 11). No better explanation of ver. 11 has been offered than that which sees in the great house Northern Israel, and in the little house Judah; cf. how Isa. viii. 14 speaks of the two houses of Israel. So read, the chapter becomes a unity, and in it the prophet addresses the whole nation, alike in the denunciation of woe and in the scope of the ruin.

If, comparing 2 Kings xiv. 25, we retain the reading 'brook of the Arabah' and understand it of the territory of Israel proper under Jeroboam II., then Marti's objection (*Comm.*, p. 198) to the mention of Zion in ver. 1 as 'ganz ungehörig' is valid, and it will be necessary to remove the phrase without any evident reason for its having been inserted. Probably, as Wellhausen suggested, מצרים was changed into הערבה by someone who saw that Judah escaped from the ruin brought by Assyria, but who did not see that his knife must cut deeper and remove the sentence in ver. 1. As so often happens, we have to balance probabilities; but the greater probability lies with the reading which offers a reason for the change.

[5] That a judgment did befall Israel not long after the prophet had spoken must not be allowed to blind our eyes to the fact that the judgment which Amos foretold did not exactly come to pass as he expected it. Thus Tyre was not conquered at this time (i. 10), nor

did the Syrians return to Kir (i. 5). Yet these events were foretold by the prophet on the same ground on which he foretold the destruction of Israel—namely, the anger of Jahveh against their sins.

[6] Read תֵּבֵל for חֵלֶק.

[7] In ver. 13 read מֵפִיק and תָּפוּק for מעיק and תעיק.

[8] Because this is fundamental in Amos, there is no valid reason for assigning the nature-passages to a later date. It is true that these passages show little connection with the context in which they stand. But Amos has a habit of being very abrupt in his transitions. And it deserves notice that, the more the want of connection between the verses and the context is pressed, the more difficult does it become to understand why a late exilic author should have gone over the prophecy and sprinkled these great sayings into the body of the book, as if out of a pepper-pot. It seems more likely that the original author should have introduced them, in spite of their want of close cohesion, than that some one at a much later date should thus have dropped them in. Though the suspicion cast on the nature-passages seems unjustifiable, I have not appealed to them in the text, because they are so generally suspect. Duhm's supposition that they have come in from the margin is possible; but the margin with Duhm, *Anmerkungen zu den Zwölf Propheten*, has come to play the part of a *deus ex machina*.

[9] The verse recurs almost verbatim in Joel iv. 16, but has there shed its incongruous connection with the top of Carmel and the pastures. It is natural to conclude that the borrower has felt the incongruity of the description of the effect, or wrote at a time when Carmel was no longer part of the land occupied by Israel. He has retained only the grandiose sentence as to Jahveh's appearance. Accordingly, while one hesitates to pronounce with any confidence that Joel has borrowed from Amos or Amos from Joel, the greater probability is that, if there has been any borrowing at all, the passage in Amos is the original.

[10] *Die Mosesagen und die Leviten* in *Kleine Schriften*, p. 349, Halle, 1910, and *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, pp. xvi, 451 ff. The texts are to be found in a very accessible form in *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder herausgegeben von* H. Gressmann, pp. 204 ff.

[11] *Der Ursprung der Israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie.* This volume is of peculiar value for every Old Testament student, and at

present for New Testament students also. I take this opportunity of expressing my debt to Gressmann for having thrown fresh light on a great deal that was puzzling in the early prophets.

[12] There are obvious difficulties in the way of both theories as to the source of these conceptions; but it is better to leave these to be stated and considered by students whose knowledge of Egyptian and Canaanite religion is more at first-hand than mine. It deserves, however, to be emphasised (and for its emphasis, as for its recognition, no special knowledge of these religions is necessary) that the permanent significance of the idea of the world-catastrophe is not due to its ultimate source or to its original form, whatever these may have been, but to the new content which has been given to it by the Hebrew prophets. So long as the conception possessed only its early content, it remained without great influence; and it would either have passed into oblivion with those who first framed it (as in the case of the Canaanites, if it can be proved that these ever held the conception in any form), or would have been recovered from the dead records of an early religion (as in the case of the Egyptians), and presented itself to us as one of the inscrutable things which stir men's curiosity in connection with perished religions. Even if Israel borrowed the framework, Amos has so filled it with a new content that it could not die, but remained a living force in the thought of his nation and of the world.

And this leads to a further observation. The Egyptian parallels, as they have been translated by Dr. Ranke, are unhappily very fragmentary, and so few in number and so isolated in their peculiar character among the remains of early Egyptian literature, that there is need for great caution in estimating their value. But two of them (on pp. 207 ff. of *opus cit.*) show the presence of that idea of the world-cycles which in one form or another appears with a constant persistence in all Eastern thought. After the divine intervention with its resultant cataclysm, the world is to return to its original condition and to resume the form from which it came; yet it only returns to run the same course, and so, after another cycle, to suffer a similar cataclysm. The conception is familiar in its grandiose form in the Babylonian representation of the world-cycles, each of which is under one of the stars. Into this scheme Hebrew thought introduced the idea of development, because of its strong grasp of the personality and the will of God. Since the world-cataclysm was the outcome of an act of God, who was realising His will in the world, each

intervention on God's part marked a stage in advance. The universe did not return on itself to run the same course anew, but each fresh beginning must be based on the gain and loss of the past, in which also there was something of God's mind. History had a reality in it, and humanity grew, as a man grows, learning from the past. Hence, when the priestly legislation at a much later date framed its great scheme of the course of the world, marked by four acts of the divine intervention, in Adam, in Noah, in Abraham, in Moses, it probably borrowed the fourfold scheme from the Babylonian world-year. The universe, like the world, had its spring, summer, autumn and winter. But this legislation announced no mere reversion to the beginning, when the course was run. Each stage was marked by a clearer unfolding of the divine nature, which is expressed by the change in the divine name. And each stage was marked by resultant institutions, the Noachic laws, circumcision, the Mosaic ritual and legislation, which embody this better knowledge. Behind the course of the world, to Hebrew thought, was a personal God, who in His care for man brought something of Himself to light; and therefore each world-age was distinguished by a new revelation and a new covenant, a deepened knowledge and a deepening relation.

I think this thought of how the world was an organism, with its inevitable higher view of history, was one great contribution of the Hebrew to the world's thought. So far as I can see, even Greek thought never broke away from the Eastern conception of the world-cycles until it had been fertilised by the infusion of this Hebrew contribution. Here, in Amos and Hosea (on whom see p. 133, *infra*), we find the instinctive revolt from the Eastern conception, and recognise that its source and cause was the strong sense of personality, human and divine, which characterised all the faith of the prophets.

[13] Cf. *Der Ursprung*, p. 148 and *passim*.

[14] The same thing appears in the story of Elijah. He is commissioned to announce a divine intervention which is to shake down the sinful kingdom, and he receives a theophany. But, when the storm, earthquake and fire pass before the prophet, it is added with a simple but notable deliberation that Jahveh was not in any of these nature-phenomena. The old methods of describing a theophany are still employed, but they are used with a certain uneasiness and a sense of their being inadequate to express the nature of Jahveh.

[15] Lehmann-Haupt, *Israel*, pp. 80 ff. and 88 f.; *Armenien einst und jetzt*, i. pp. 219 ff.

[16] Cf. Stärk, *Das Assyrische Weltreich*, pp. 9 f.

[17] So Winckler, *KAT*[3], pp. 170 f.

[18] Cf. Montefiore, *Hibbert Lecture*, 1892[2], pp. 150 f.

[19] A modification of this general view represents the overthrow of Ammon and Moab as the result of the backwash of the victors when they returned northward after their conquest of Egypt.

[20] The latter difficulty has led to the usual resource of relegating certain passages, especially those concerning Nineveh, Moab and Ammon, to the exile. But these passages are exactly those which are most difficult to explain on the theory of an exilic or post-exilic origin. Why refer to Nineveh at all, when Nineveh has fallen and Babylon is the oppressor? Why is Edom omitted, while Moab and Ammon are mentioned? The exilic and post-exilic authors, with their well-known hatred for Edom, were least likely to omit Edom. A. B. Davidson (*Cambr. Bible*, "Zephaniah," p. 99), because of these difficulties, declared "no principle is to be detected in the order any more than in Amos i.," and so at least recognised the singular correspondence between the points of view of the two prophets.

As my concern with Zephaniah is merely to illustrate Amos, I have not given references for the opinions which are stated above. The student can now (1912) find them carefully and succinctly stated by Dr. Smith in the International Critical Commentary on Zephaniah. I cannot refrain from expressing the opinion that Dr. Smith is more conscious than many of his predecessors of the difficulties which attend the opinion that Zephaniah was prompted to his prophecy by the threatened incursion of the Scythians, and is sorely embarrassed by the order in which Zephaniah marshals the nations.

[21] In the same way Hosea predicts (viii. 13) that Israel shall return into Egypt, whence Jahveh called them (xi. 1). Jahveh, who made them a nation, is about to undo His work. See the discussion (on p. 107, *infra*) as to Hosea's attitude.

[22] Here it is that the nature-passages are so suitable to the fundamental ideas of the prophet.

[23] So Smend, *Religionsgeschichte*, p. 191.

[24] I have omitted all reference to ix. 8*b* ff. in the picture of the national future, because, while there are elements in this which appear old and may even date from Amos, the passage has received so much alteration that it is practically useless for determining the early view.

In particular, there is one matter in which this passage occupies

a totally different position from Amos. It counts it necessary to predict a restoration of the people as a people. Now, though Amos is uncertain as to the fate of the remnant, his uncertainty is not due to the fact that the national life has come to an end. Even in such a condition the pitiful remnant is not out of all possible relation to Jahveh. The nation was never the 'unit of religion' to Amos, for the remnant might find its place in that which Jahveh was about to bring into being on a condition which has nothing to do with the vanished forms of their national existence—the simple condition of repentance. In this as in much else, Amos was away from the national, and at the position of a universal religion.

[25] Even Stade (*Biblische Theologie des ATs.*, p. 220) acknowledged how little the prophet's attitude of mind agrees with the idea of revelation having come to him in ecstasy. I quote Stade in this connection, because he held a strong view as to the close association between Israelite prophecy and the Canaanite or heathen mantic, and was therefore specially inclined to see evidences of ecstasy in the conduct of the prophets.

[26] As, *e.g.*, Smend in his *Religionsgeschichte*, p. 188, seems to do. Nowack, *Die Zukunftshoffnungen Israels in der Assyrischen Zeit*, p. 40, has recently expressed himself with greater caution: "Diese letzteren (cc. 1. 2, in Amos), die scheinbar widersprechen, sind, genauer betrachtet (wie Giesebrecht hervorhebt), ebenfalls ein Beweis dass die Reflexion auf die Sünde erst die Rechtfertigung der als drohend erkannten Katastrophe aber nicht ihre Ursache bildet."

Now the real thing we need to know is how and why Amos reached the conclusion that the catastrophe threatened Israel although it was Jahveh's folk. Evidently it was here that he broke away from the expectation of pious men in Israel. The only ground I can see is that he recognised the cause of the catastrophe in the character of Jahveh and in the presence of sin, greater even than that of the nations, within Israel.

[27] Cf. W. R. Smith, *Prophets*[2], pp. 137 f.

[28] Cf. Löhr, *Untersuchungen zum Buche Amos*, pp. 32 ff.

[29] To say that Jahveh and Israel were conceived, as god and people in all the period were conceived, as inseparable, and that Amos was the first to teach that Jahveh might suffer the nation to perish without perishing Himself (so Nowack, p. 20), is to set the religious condition of the nation and of the whole period too low. Other nations could and did believe that their god in his anger

suffered them to be defeated by their enemies. There were cases in abundance of tribes and peoples which had been blotted from the page of history, and it is difficult to understand why men were unable to conclude about these that their gods had been too weak to defend or too angry to support them. As a matter of fact, the priesthood of Babylon ascribe the collapse of their capital and the rise of Cyrus to control over Babylonia to the anger of Marduk. Cf. Nöldeke, *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte*, 1887, p. 22, and see the inscription itself in the Cyrus cylinder, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, iii. 2, pp. 121 ff. The king of Moab who sacrificed his son on the wall (2 Kings iii. 27) evidently believed that his defeat at Israel's hands was due to the anger of his god, whom he therefore sought to propitiate.

But in heathenism either such an act on the part of the god was the outcome of the dreadful will of one whose nature was beyond his worshipper's comprehension, and was therefore atoned for by equally inscrutable rites; or it was, as is expressly stated in the Cyrus cylinder, the outcome of certain sins against the cult of Marduk.

Amos believed that he knew the reason for Jahveh's rejection of His people, because he knew the nature of the God whom he worshipped. Jahveh's act was no capricious exercise of the divine power, it was motived by a purpose into which men could reverently inquire, and Israel in particular could find its reason in the purpose Jahveh showed Himself to have with them in all His past relations to them. This, not the idea that Jahveh could reject the people, was the new element in the prophet's thought.

[30] Cf., from a different point of view, W. R. Smith, *Prophets*[2], pp. 137 f. Cf. also Valeton, "Amos and Hosea," in Echternacht's translation, pp. 27 ff.

Here is the point of connection between Amos' conception and the later idea of the covenant-relation between Jahveh and His people. Amos, as is natural in a prophet, speaks of a common purpose: the later law-makers naturally speak of a covenant.

[31] Cf. Smend, *Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 198 f.

[32] This is the more noteworthy, because Hosea (ii. 13, 15) reckons new moon and sabbath among the יְמֵי הַבְּעָלִים and so seems to regard the observance of these days as having had a heathen origin.

[33] That this is the point of view from which Amos regards the

days of festival is supported by the fact that Deuteronomy finds a motive for the seventh-day rest in the humanitarian thought of the needs of the poor (v. 14 f.).

[34] Cf. Baethgen, *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, p. 181 n. When Baethgen, however, suggests that Amos arrived at his conclusion as to the non-existence of offerings in the desert, because in his view the material for offering was wanting there, I see no justification for burdening the prophet with so false a view of facts, or so limited a conception of Jahveh's power to supply the want, had He counted it necessary.

[35] In v. 26 the centre of the verse is hopelessly corrupt. But whatever את סכות מלככם ואת כיון צלמיכם כוכב אלהיכם may be interpreted to mean, they are things which the people made for themselves. Then the last clause of ver. 26 stands in strong contrast with ver. 25: Israel made these things out of their own heads without instruction from Jahveh. Israel shall take them up, these self-chosen means of worship; and Jahveh will sweep them away, means of worship and worshippers together, into the outer darkness.

[36] Cf. Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten*, pp. 116 f.; Montefiore, *Hibbert Lecture*, 1892², pp. 122 f.

[37] How wide and informal is the sense in which צְדָקָה is construed in early prophecy can be seen from the fact that Hosea makes it interchangeable with חֶסֶד (xii. 7, x. 12 f. Cf. Mic. vi. 8).

By his broad attitude in this matter Amos escapes from the reproach of being one who looked with suspicious dislike on all the new movement of his time and who aimed simply at bringing back the severer conditions of a primitive period. That he does show dislike to the new luxury is certain, and that part of this may be the outcome of his desert habits is probable. But he desires the old, because of the greater brotherhood it showed among men who felt themselves united in a common task, *i.e.* because it had a moral basis.

[38] Kleinert, *Die Profeten Israels in sozialer Beziehung*.

[39] There is no ground for the statement that Amos puts away the suggestion of his being a prophet 'mit Entrüstung,' to quote only one of the unwarranted additions which are made to his reply to Amaziah from Valeton, p. 92. In one form or another that suggestion is continually slipped into the prophet's answer.

CHAPTER V

[1] The presence of שָׁם, 'there,' in vi. 7, and the local references in the following verses, are the sufficient proof that in כאדם is the corruption of some place-name. Yet the place-name which is suggested can at best only be the result of conjecture.

[2] The first clause of i. 2, תְּחִלַּת דִּבֶּר יהוה בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ, cannot be used justly to prove anything. The abruptness of the clause, the difficulty of construing it in the situation in which it stands, the *pisqa* by which it is marked off from what follows, and the fact that דִּבֶּר בְּ, in the sense of 'speaking to,' is common in the late prophecy of Zechariah, while in the following clause of i. 2 דבר אֶל is employed, all these things make it likely that the clause is an addition: 'Here beginneth the prophecy of Hosea.' It may have stood in front of the text of the book, before i. 1 had been prefixed as a title, in order to mark off the oracles from what preceded them in a roll.

[3] In the *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1898, pp. 321 ff. I have said nothing about Volz's view developed there that Hosea regarded the land, not the people, as the bride of Jahveh, because I really do not understand what it means.

[4] Volz has not turned the force of this objection by insisting that the ancient prophets considered themselves mere will-less instruments in the divine hands, for the difficulty does not lie in conceiving a man to have obeyed such an order (men have done worse things to please their kings), but in a prophet conceiving of Jahveh as having issued the order.

[5] Cf. A. B. Davidson, *Biblical and Literary Essays*, p. 83.

[6] *Theologie der Propheten.*

[7] There is no reason to question the authenticity of the early prophecy (i. 4). On the one hand, the fact that, so far as we know, the bow of Israel was not broken in Jezreel, makes it unlikely that a later editor introduced so definite a statement as this. On the other hand, the prophecy is thoroughly in keeping with Hosea's style. His doom on Israel, as we shall see, is expressed symbolically,—he is fond of representing how all sin carries with it its penalty,—and this prophecy means simply that, where the blood cried for vengeance (2 Kings x. 5–11), it should not cry in vain.

[8] Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*,

p. 301, has drawn attention to the fact that "in an inscription which relates the events of the year 733 Pul declares he has incorporated into his realm all the towns of the house of Omri, has carried captive their inhabitants, and has only left Samaria." This corresponds with the statement in 2 Kings xv. 29, where it is said that Pul carried captive all the inhabitants of the Northern parts of Israel, and stripped Galilee of its population. If, then, we could suppose that part at least of Hosea's book was produced after this invasion, we should have a good reason for Hosea's frequent use of Ephraim instead of Israel, since Israel had practically become Ephraim. Winckler, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*[3], p. 264, gave the same reason for Hosea's use of the expression Ephraim. And then some of the results of the Assyrian attack, such as the captivity of the calf of Samaria (x. 5 f.), must be interpreted, not as mere threats on the prophet's part, but as representations of a ruin which has already begun, and for which Hosea is finding a reason in the just anger of Jahveh.

On the other side, however, it must be recognised that Pul's invasion was the outcome of the coalition on the part of Syria and Israel against Judah, which formed so signal a part of Isaiah's ministry: and it is difficult to realise how, if this coalition had taken place in Hosea's period, he could have remained silent about it; still more difficult to understand why, while he refers to treaties with Egypt and Assyria (vii. 11, viii. 9, etc.), he nowhere mentions Syria, with which, according to this view, Israel stood in much closer connection. Further, while Hosea speaks of Israel as Ephraim, he speaks of Gilead and Mizpah in the transjordanic district as though they still belonged to Israel (vi. 8, v. 1; contr. Mic. vii. 14); and he always addresses himself to a nation with the self-consciousness of a nation, not to a city with its dependent tribe. Again, while Assyria is frequently referred to in the book, it is never referred to as a nation with which Israel is in hostility, but always as one which Israel seeks to gain as an ally. The approaches made by Israel to Assyria are all regarded as voluntary on Israel's part—a situation which ceased to be possible after the collapse of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition and the emergence of Assyria in Western Asia as a conqueror.

[9] In xi. 5 read לֹא as לוֹ and add it to the final clause of xi. 4. The verse reads: 'He shall return to the land of Egypt, and Assyria shall be his king.'

[10] Read תִּקְרְבֵם: in this way one obtains an excellent contrast to the gatherings at the festivals of ver. 5.

[11] I take xii. 4–7 and 13 f. to be extracts from the versified temple-legends which were current in the mouths of those who frequented the sanctuary at Bethel. Hosea takes up the songs and turns them to his own purposes. This view is shared by Van Hoonacker, *Les Douze Petits Prophètes*, *q.v. ad loc.* When Duhm, *Anmerkungen zu den Zwölf Propheten*, *ad loc.*, selects these verses, regards them as having formed a late poem, and suggests that, in the representation of the angel as begging with tears for a release from Jacob, the writer was following a midrash on Gen. xxxii., he seems to fail to recognise that such a conception of the attitude of man to the divine representative is one which was little likely to prevail at so late a period. Further, it is somewhat difficult to understand how the poem came to be written on the margin of Hosea and then incorporated into the text. What was the point of attachment? Did the author merely use the margin of a prophetic text because he happened to have no other parchment on which he could write his productions?

[12] I cannot agree with Kraetzschmar, *Bundesvorstellung des ATs.*, who thinks that Hosea differs from Amos in finding a reason for the historic proof of the divine love.

[13] One must recognise that Hosea's idea of the marriage between himself and his faithless wife does not exhaust the entire relation between Jahveh and the people. This relation could only represent one part, since a man who marries a woman marries one who is already in a very different position from that in which every Hebrew set nation or individual before God. In fact, one must be on one's guard against being hag-ridden by metaphors.

[14] Those who are compelled to reject the nature-passages from Amos must recognise that the later glossator who added them showed a singular fineness of judgment in selecting Amos' prophecy as the suitable place for their insertion. I confess that it shows a niceness of discrimination which is not much in evidence in the undoubted interpolations of the later glossators.

[15] W. R. Smith, *Prophets*[2], pp. 165 f.

[16] Read בַּעַל for בּוֹשֶׁת.

[17] Read רֹב תּוֹרָתִי. The text implies that the laws which embody the divine will for Israel are still in course of being

promulgated, and that the relation between the people and its God is close and constant. Jahveh's directions are not regulations which have been once uttered and despised, but Jahveh is now speaking through His agents, and finding no attention.

[18] Read יִשְׂרָאֵל for יְהוּדָה and רָב for מַלְכֵי רָב.

[19] There is no necessity for changing עָשׂוּ לַבַּעַל. The phrase is parallel to וְהֵיא לֹא יָדְעָה: the people not only failed to recognise these things as a gift from Jahveh, they even used them for an alien worship.

[20] This remarkable feature of the prophetic teaching—it appears in Isaiah as well as in Hosea—is to me inexplicable, unless we can posit some early conception of the jealousy of Jahveh, and some conception of the close relation between worship offered to Jahveh and a type of life in the nation offering that worship.

[21] The view, so far as I know, was first propounded—it certainly was strongly held—by Duhm, *Theologie der Propheten*, pp. 100, 133.

[22] For a full and careful discussion of Hosea's attitude to the kingdom, see Valeton, *Amos und Hosea* in *Echternacht's Translation*, pp. 163 ff.

The following are all the passages in which Hosea refers to the kingdom :—

i. 4 f. means, not the kingdom in principle, but the house of Jehu with its specific crime.

iii. 4. Where the people is to be chastised by being stripped of king and princes, the emblems of its strength.

v. 1. The existing kingdom and priesthood are condemned for what they have done.

v. 10. The princes are like land-grabbers—the existing princes.

vii. 3 ff. contains a description of the anarchy to which the nation has reduced itself.

vii. 16. 'Their [existing] princes shall fall by the sword.'

viii. 4 refers to the present, in which 'they have set up kings, but not by Me.' The context shows there is no reference to anything beyond the present.

ix. 9. 'They have deeply corrupted themselves, as in the days of Gibeah.' The context contains no reference to the kingdom.

15. 'All their princes are revolters.'

x. 3. 'The king, what can he do for us?'

x. 7. 'Samaria's king is cut off.'

9. 'Thou hast sinned from the days of Gibeah.'

15. 'The king of Israel shall be cut off.'

xiii. 10 ff. 'Where now is thy king?'

So far are these texts from implying a rejection of the kingdom in itself that several of them (iii. 4, x. 7, 10, xiii. 10 ff.) point rather to the loss of the king as the proof that the nation has lost a source of national pride and hope.

[23] Read יִשְׂרָאֵל.

Note that Hosea does not accuse these men of being land-grabbers. He says they are like these, or no better than these. So one might accuse a Lord Lieutenant of Ireland of being like a gombeen-man without actually meaning that he lent out money to the peasantry.

[24] In spite of the deplorable condition of the text, this is clearly the general sense of vii. 1–7.

[25] In v. 1 omit הַקְשִׁיבוּ בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל. The prophet is not, in the following verses, addressing the people, but the rulers.

[26] See the Excursus which follows Chapter II.

[27] The sense of משפט in Hos. v. 1, as meaning not that the divine judgment is about to fall on the priesthood, but that they have the duty of declaring judgment, is determined by Deut. xvii. 11, where the priests are said to teach the law to the people and to declare משפט in connection with every judicial question which has been found too hard for the local judges. It has frequently been supposed that משפט is used by Hosea, notably in vi. 5, in the sense of judgment falling on evil-doers, and to construe v. 1 in the same sense of a judgment. But even in vi. 5, the passage of Hosea which seems to support most clearly the translation of משפט as judgment or penalty, משפטי may mean—and, I think, is best construed as—My claim. Hosea says there that Jahveh made His claim on the people clear: He hewed them by the prophets; He slew them by the words of His mouth; His claims on His nation went forth like the light (cf. Jer. v. 4 f.). And the close parallel between the passages in Hosea and Deuteronomy,—especially when one remembers how this is not the only place where Deuteronomy shows itself deeply influenced by Hosea,—along with the fact that in Deuteronomy the priest and judge are associated in the function of resolving hard cases of judicial decision, seems to make it clear that it is this function of the priesthood on which Hosea lays stress.

[28] I cannot accept the interpretation of iv. 8 according to which the priests are regarded as having positively encouraged sin in order that they might receive a larger revenue, since the major part of all sin-offerings fell to the priesthood. Even if one could believe in such coarseness of mind on the part of the official heads of religion at any time, I do not see, if the priests were thought of here as merely superintending the cult, how with the best will to do it, the thing could be done. How, if they merely superintended the sacrifices, did they encourage sin in order to have more sin-offerings?

Besides, the position requires us to posit a development of the ritual sin-offering in early Israel, for which there is no proof. It would be too much to say that the sin-offering did not exist, but it is not too much to say that in the worship which prevailed in Northern Israel offerings for sin held a very subordinate place.

[29] W. R. Smith, *Prophets*[2], pp. 161 f., excellently contrasts with Hosea's attitude the primitive conception according to which David says to Jonathan, 'Thou shalt show kindness to thy servant, for thou hast brought thy servant into a covenant of Jahveh with thee' (1 Sam. xx. 8). In that temper of mind there is need for a covenant, because without it no mutual faith can be expected on either side. Hosea conceived the relation between Israelites as one where mutual faith could be taken for granted, and where men can live, as they do in a home, without the need for a code to define their rights and duties. Any law which defines these relations is accepted and recognised as inadequate to satisfy.

[30] W. R. Smith, *Prophets*[2], p. 177.

It is right to recognise that Hosea does not appeal to the second commandment and condemn the worship at Samaria on the ground that it is contrary to the fundamental law of the decalogue. But his attitude proves nothing as to the existence or non-existence of that commandment at his time, a question which must be determined on other grounds. He was a prophet, not a legalist; and as a prophet he was down at the roots of spiritual religion out of which the second commandment took its origin and from which it will at all times draw its peculiar power.

[31] Thus Kautzsch, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, pressed the first clause of the verse, and decided that the second clause must be read, 'the knowledge of God, not burnt-offerings.' It is only necessary to say that, from the point of view of strict Hebrew idiom, the ordinary rendering of the second clause as 'more than burnt-

offerings' is perfectly legitimate. The emphasis a reader lays on the first or the second clause depends on his conception of the whole attitude of the prophet. Kautzsch is governed by his idea that the early prophets rejected the sacrificial worship entirely: I hope my text, with its discussion of Hosea's general attitude, proves that another view is reasonable and just. I cannot but think that this view at least faces the fact that the sacrificial worship came to a new position and a previously unknown power in the religion of Israel *after* the work of the early prophets. The view represented by Kautzsch seems to me to make the utterances of the prophets by-products which produced on one great and fundamental issue very little effect.

[32] Read פָּרַי for פָּרִים.

[33] I read vi. 1–3 like xii. 4–7 as part of a temple-song which was used at one of the great festivals. Hosea takes up the song, in which their view of Jahveh's character and of the means of satisfying Him is embodied, and develops it in his own way in the later verses. Construe the verses thus, and it can be easily understood why Hosea, in the following verses, deals specially with the priests who had their place at the great centre of worship, where the song was in use.

[34] The last clause of ver. 14, 'repentance is hid from Mine eyes,' makes it clear that we must read the earlier clause as a threat, not, 'where, O death, are thy plagues?'

[35] It is here, in the idea of God having, as it were, committed Himself in any act of intervention, that I find the point where the Hebrew thought instinctively revolted against the conception of the world æons already referred to under Amos on pp. 259 f.

[36] Meinhold, *Studien zur Israelitischen Religionsgeschichte*, believes that, with the rise of the Assyrian power about 738, Hosea's attitude altered. The prophet, feeling that Jahveh could not cast Israel wholly away, began to speak of banishment instead of absolute ruin. To this period Meinhold would therefore assign chs. viii.–xi. In these chapters, he thinks, it is Assyria, not Jahveh, who is the enemy; and it is Assyria who is to bring the Israelite state to an end (x. 14 f., xi. 5). Assyria is no longer the helper to whom they turn for assistance, but the source of their ruin. Yet, though they shall go into captivity, it shall not be for ever.

Here one welcomes the recognition that Hosea's position was likely to change. Because his marriage with Gomer was so potent a factor in his work as a prophet, his message was sure to develop

as that marriage changed in its results for him. I agree with Meinhold that we must set ch. iii. much later than ch. i., and that, since the prophet's effort to win back his wife is later than the unfaithfulness which she showed, the thoughts as to God's final purpose with Israel, which are so closely connected with the prophet's inability to cast away his wife, are late. In the prophecy chs. iv.–xii. there probably are different positions which correspond to this change.

But I can see no proof that it was the mere fact of Assyria's appearance on the horizon which changed the prophet's view. In ix. 3–6 Hosea dwells more on Egypt than on Assyria; in viii. 13, indeed, Assyria is not mentioned at all; in ix. 17 Hosea is satisfied to say that Israel shall be wanderers among the nations: in all these, Assyria is not in a special position as the instrument of the divine anger. The absence of any statement that Assyria shall be the instrument of their punishment is as remarkable in these chapters as in all the earlier chapters; and there is as strong an insistence on the truth that the real enemy is Jahveh Himself.

I think one must look for the explanation of a change in the prophet's mind to his deeper and graver thought over what was implied in the belief, which was fundamental to all his thinking, that Israel owed its being to the love of its God.

[37] It deserves notice that Nowack, *Die Zukunftshoffnungen Israels in der Assyrischen Zeit* in the *Festgabe für Holtzmann*, p. 43, has resiled from the position he took in his Commentary, and now declares the vers. 16–18, 20–25 in ch. ii. to be, with slight exception, Hosea's. Now the interest of this position for the present question is that one reason, which prompted Nowack in the Comm. to reject the verses, was that they brought so strongly to the front the pedagogic purpose of the divine chastisement; and Nowack felt himself compelled to say that Hosea, having only ruin to predict, could not regard the penalty as pedagogic. Even after these verses were cut out, that element in the prophet's thought is present in the chapter; but undoubtedly it comes more powerfully to the front in the verses which Nowack now feels himself compelled to restore.

[38] I see no reason to doubt the authenticity of ch. xiv., excluding ver. 10. The oracle is thoroughly Hoseanic in tone and temper. The prophet foresees a time when his countrymen shall abjure their reliance on foreign help, their self-confidence, and their worship of images (in ver. 5). These are the three leading forms in which their

fundamental sin of departing from Jahveh appeared and on account of which the prophet denounced the anger of God. The vagueness of the expression, 'neither will we say any more to the work of our hands ye are our gods,' which leaves it open to construe the clause as idolatry in the sense of worshipping strange gods or as the worship of Jahveh through images, agrees with the way in which Hosea represents the popular worship (see p. 126 *supra*). And the view of Assyria as the nation from which Israel expects help is only possible before the date of the Syro-Ephraimitic league : after that Assyria was the enemy.

[39] Read for אני עניתי ואאשרנו : אני עניתי ואשורנו—'It is I who afflicted, and I will render him blessed.' The emphasis is on 'I.' When Israel has learned how all its past has been guided by Jahveh, it will lay the emphasis on Jahveh for all its future.

[40] See Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der Israelitisch Jüdischen Eschatologie*, pp. 194 f. I think Gressmann has failed to recognise the fact that Hosea has nothing to say as to the place of the heathen powers in the new order of things. Here, as through his entire prophecy, Hosea is the particularist. The heathen powers are vague, shadowy things which are only thought of in connection with their influence on Israel. It is probable that, since he held this view, he had no place for them in the consummation and conceived them as non-existent. But it is no more than probable. When Gressmann says, as over against the idea of the weapons being taken away from Israel alone, " viel richtiger und zweckdienlicher wäre es, die Rüstungen der Feinde zu vernichten, und man begreift nicht warum der Prophet nicht dies Wunder erwartet haben sollte, da ja auch die Entwaffnung Israels auf die Tat Jahves zurückgeführt werden muss," he takes it for granted that in Hosea's view the heathen continue in the consummation. Do they? Is it not possible that Hosea is merely describing the new condition of the new world, where only the reconciled endure, and that he is describing it as a condition which is so governed by the *hesed* he found wanting in the Israel of his own time that the weapons disappear? Such an expectation is quite in line with all the rest of his prophecy.

CHAPTER VI.

[1] The monument of Eshmunazar speaks of the holy gods, as though this were a familiar title of the gods of Phœnicia. See Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 31 (1903).

[2] Cf. W. R. Smith, *Prophets*[2], pp. 224 f.; Smend, *AT. Religionsgeschichte*, p. 150 *et passim.*

[3] W. R. Smith, *Prophets*[2], p. 231. Thus Jerusalem is said to be ruined and Judah to be fallen, because their tongue and their doings are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of His glory (iii. 8); they have set themselves, alike in the inward and outward drift of their lives, against the divine Will which upholds all things.

[4] Read עַל instead of אֶל in vii. 15, because of the way in which Amos quoted the words of Amaziah in ver. 16: 'Thou sayest, prophesy not against Israel, and drop not thy word against the house of Isaac.'

[5] I owe the first suggestion that vers. 9–13 are in no sense the final message which Isaiah was commissioned to deliver to my friend, Prof. Stevenson of Glasgow University; but, while I acknowledge my debt to him for a suggestion which he developed along his own lines, I have no wish to make him responsible for the conclusions which are here drawn from it.

[6] Cf. some valuable remarks on the subject in Duhm, *Theologie der Propheten*, pp. 83 f.

[7] The final clause of ver. 13 is made suspicious through its absence from the LXX, and is quite incompatible with the preceding clauses. It is impossible to interpret בער in any other sense than that of utter destruction. To בָּעֵר a vineyard is either to stub out the old vine roots or to burn them out: the true reading of Ex. xxii. 5 makes it likely that the latter was the general sense. In either case, it is to make so clean a sweep that the old roots cannot revive. Probably the final clause of ver. 13 owes its origin to the period when vers. 9–13 had already come to be interpreted as the summing-up of Isaiah's message to his people. Some one, who recognised that the verses did not, as a matter of fact, cover the whole scope of the prophet's message, felt it necessary to add a clause which was right in substance. When one sees that vers. 9–13 are not such a summing-up, the omission of the clause becomes of less importance.

[8] Giesebrecht, *Beiträge zur Jesaja-kritik*, pp. 87 ff., and Dillmann, *Jesaja*[6], p. 54, regard these verses as the later impression of the prophet, after he had encountered Ahaz (ch. vii.) and failed to turn the king from his purpose. Then we are to understand that Isaiah put the impression, which had come to him through his failure to convert Ahaz, as to the judicial blindness of the people into the form of the statement that this had been Jahveh's purpose from the

beginning, as Hosea said that he married a wife of whoredom after Jahveh's command. The interpretation makes Isaiah turn his commission into the direct opposite. He went to meet Ahaz with the divine commission to plead with him for the recovery of the nation; but, when he found the people unwilling to listen, he declared that Jahveh sent him, not to convert them, but to harden their hearts (cf. Meinhold, *Studien*, p. 90 n.). That in itself is hard to believe without more sufficient proof than is offered. But it further ignores how in chs. vii. f. it is not the people but the court who are rejected for their obduracy, while here it is the people as a whole which is regarded as deaf to the divine call.

[9] I cannot agree with Hackmann, *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, pp. 72 ff., in the view that 'this people' (vi. 9) means Northern Israel, and that therefore Isaiah's first oracles are directed exclusively against Samaria. The prophet who said that he dwelt among a people of unclean lips could not turn to direct his commission of judgment against a people among whom he did not dwell. And this consideration, which is of a somewhat a priori character, is supported by the actual tenor of the earlier oracles as cited in the text.

[10] Note in passing that 'the Lord of Hosts' is a favourite title of Jahveh in Amos.

[11] In his early volume, *Die Theologie der Propheten* (1875), p. 159, Duhm noted this characteristic of the prophet's thought: "Judgment with Isaiah is not a series of chastisements, but one distinct catastrophe"; and again, "Es ist eine Art jüngsten Gericht dieser Tag Jahvehs." He failed, however, to notice how all the citations brought to prove this position were taken from the early oracles, and from those which were specially directed against North Israel. It is the weakness of the treatment of Isaiah in that volume that there is no adequate recognition of the different periods of the prophet's activity. In his Comm. on Isaiah, *ad loc.*, Duhm recognises the unethical character of a judgment which included lofty mountains, but fails to explain the presence of this feature in a prophet whose characteristic quality is so different. Cheyne also, in 1895 (*Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 16), recognised how, in ii. 6–22, Isaiah "rises completely above local and national circumstances, and idealises the national almost into a universal judgment (not Yahwè and Israel, but God and man fill up the painter's canvas)." The description is just so far as it goes, but the fact that the oracle is early, and is that from which the prophet begins, is ignored.

[12] This oracle is now generally taken as the concluding strophe of ix. 7–x. 4, but no adequate reason has been offered for its displacement. It is possible that its separation from the rest of the oracle is due to the fact that ix. 7–x. 4 in its original form existed without it, and hence without any definite mention of the Assyrian as the instrument of the divine judgment. The oracle of v. 25–30 belongs to a later date, and was therefore rightly separated from the longer oracle, which in form it so closely resembles.

[13] Cf. Meinhold, *Studien*, p. 98.

[14] Translate, not as in R.V., but literally: 'And there shall be left therein only gleanings.'

[15] Even in form Isaiah is deeply influenced by the earlier prophet. The tremendous series of calamities which he pronounces against Samaria (v. 8 ff. and ix. 7–x. 4) is like the picture of one woe following upon another which Amos also employed. Stärk, *Das Assyrische Weltreich*, p. 47, notes the similarity in form between Isaiah and Amos, but has failed to note the similarity in thought.

[16] I cannot agree with those who think that the reason why Isaiah appears with a message only about the remnant is that he now recognises that Northern Israel is doomed, but that he still hopes Judah may take up the great heritage, and so become the remnant. The boy was already able to walk beside his father when the prophet went to meet Ahaz. That means that his birth and the gift of his name dated from the period before Isaiah had given up all hope of Israel's return. The name must find its explanation in the earlier source of the prophet's own experience.

[17] Cf. Stärk, *Das Assyrische Weltreich*, p. 55.

[18] The failure to recognise the unconditional character of the prophecy as to the collapse of the two powers runs all through and greatly spoils Giesebrecht's admirable article on the *Immanuel Weissagung* in *St. u. Kr.* (1888).

[19] To understand Isaiah's attitude in the matter—how, *i.e.*, he could venture on such an offer to Ahaz—it is necessary to remember that he believed that the impending defeat of the Syro-Ephraimitic allies had been revealed to him by Jahveh. If Jahveh could make known, for the establishment of His Kingdom in Judah, what He was about to effect within a few years, He could also condescend to make it indubitable that this was the outcome of His counsel.

[20] The older idea that the article before עלמה is used in the sense of the species, as in Eccles. vii. 26, is still maintained by Duhm,

who has not altered the position he took in *Die Theologie der Propheten*, p. 163 n. He holds that what is meant by the prophecy is that women,—any woman in Israel,—after the Syrians are gone, shall call their children Immanuel, and that this is a sign to Ahaz in the sense in which the worship of the people at Mount Sinai was to be a sign to Moses (Ex. iii. 12). Then 'God with us' to these women means 'God against us' to Ahaz. Here I think Duhm is right in recognising the two leading elements in the prophecy—namely, that Isaiah is not offering a guarantee of the collapse of the coalition; and that, through Ahaz's refusal to believe, the character of the sign becomes judgment instead of salvation for those who are like-minded with the king. But Duhm ignores that the birth and naming of the child are to fall, not after the Syrians are gone, but before the collapse of the coalition (vii. 16). Evidently the foreign land is to be forsaken between the time when the child is born and the time when he knows how to distinguish between sweet and bitter. This was exactly the time when 'any woman' in Israel was least likely to call her child Immanuel, and when, if she had done so, her action had been least a sign to Ahaz. The worship at Mount Sinai was a sign after it had happened; this naming of the child before the Syrians had withdrawn is of a totally different character.

If, however, we read, as is now generally acknowledged, העלמה as 'the maiden,' and therefore as distinguishing some special maiden, —either one who is present, or one who is well known to all who are present,—there are three interpretations possible:—

1. It is possible to refer 'the maiden' to some one of the royal harem who was then known to be with child, and to see in the promised son Hezekiah. Apart from other difficulties, this explanation breaks hopelessly to my mind on the fact that the judgment is uttered against the royal house (ver. 13). Isaiah is denouncing here the house of David, which through Ahaz has set itself in the way of opposition to Jahveh.

2. Meinhold has recently taken up the view of Gesenius that the maiden is the prophet's wife, and in the interest of his theory reads קראת of ver. 14 as קָרְאָתִי—I will call. Then the promised son is the prophet's own child. Meinhold falls into new perplexities in connection with his explanation, because he holds that עלמה means a marriageable girl, *virgo intacta*; and these perplexities he labours to remove by the supposition that Isaiah may have had a subordinate wife, or may have been a widower, remarried at this

time. But apart from this, the explanation has this difficulty that, according to it, the sign which the prophet offered to Ahaz melts away into nothing more than the foreknowledge that the child of whose approaching birth Isaiah is well aware is to be a son. Yet since on this interpretation it is not of the remotest consequence whether the child was a son or a daughter, and since עמנואל could as well be predicted of a daughter as of a son, the אות really melts away in our hands into nothing.

3. We may return to the earliest interpretation, *i.e.* the Messianic. I call this the earliest interpretation because I believe that ver. 15, so puzzling in its present situation, is really a gloss which means that the heavenly child shall eat heavenly food. How difficult the verse is, unless it be interpreted as a gloss, can be seen through a comparison with ver. 22. There the eating of butter and honey is declared to be the result of the devastation of the land, and is the sign of the extent to which that devastation has been carried. At ver. 15 such a sense for the expression is pointless, since ver. 16 makes the birth of the child mark the date when the coalition against Judah shall collapse. If we put aside the verse as a gloss, then the whole chapter becomes a unity, which expresses, as over against ch. viii., the aspect of the advent of the heavenly child toward Ahaz and the court, who have refused to take the right attitude towards Isaiah's promises.

G. W. Wade, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (1911), *ad loc.*, practically agrees with this position, and adds that העלמה may be a figurative expression for Judah. The suggestion is very attractive, since then we should have an interesting parallel with the scion out of Jesse's stock, but it lacks sufficient support in Isaiah's attitude to empirical Judah. I think that Wade is still troubled in his interpretation by failure to recognise how Immanuel has nothing to do with the overthrow of Syria and North Israel. This makes him unable to recognise that in this chapter Immanuel may mean nothing but a threat against Ahaz.

On the whole question, see the article on Immanuel, admirable, so far as it goes, by A. B. Davidson in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. pp. 454 ff.

[21] If in this chapter the מלך אשור of ver. 17 and all ver. 20 are original, as I see no sufficient reason to doubt, there is here another illustration of how Isaiah has moved to the position that the agents of Jahveh are moral and intelligent agents. The vague threat

of his early period (ii. 6–22) has disappeared, and so has the threatening on inanimate things. But while Jahveh is to use Assyria to chastise the nation which put its trust in such a helper, that is the entire place given to Assyria here. The world-power is not to be the means of doing anything more than chastising the foolish people who trusted in its protection.

[22] It deserves notice that the only reason for the existence of the oracle is that it presents the meaning of Immanuel from another side. If the chapter contains no more than a repeated denunciation of judgment, it remains inexplicable why it is added at all immediately after ch. vii. and why it has been provided with a solemn introduction. To cut out vers. 9 f. (with Giesebrecht, *St. u. Kr.*, 1888) as a late addition, and so to reduce the oracle to a prediction of ruin, is not only to ignore the deliberate way in which it is introduced and attached to the name of another of Isaiah's sons, but it is to ignore the contrast between 'this people' of ver. 6, who have refused the waters of Siloah, and 'ye' of vers. 11 ff., who are said to have no fear. The oracle begins with the prediction of judgment to the ruling class, who have already chosen their lot, and passes into a promise of help to those who have not followed them; and it is exactly this new feature of Immanuel which justifies the existence of the chapter.

[23] At viii. 6 read מָסוֹס מִפְּנֵי, 'despond before,' instead of מְשׂוֹשׂ אֶת־, 'rejoice in.' There is no reason to suppose that any party existed in Jerusalem which favoured an alliance with Damascus and Samaria; the relations between Jerusalem and these powers had not, prior to the time of Isaiah, been of such a nature as to encourage such views.

[24] Cf., on the language of ver. 6, Giesebrecht, *St. u. Kr.* (1888), p. 223.

[25] To find a proof that vers. 9 f. must be a later addition in the fact that only after Assyria had actually invaded Palestine did any prophet see a conquering army made up of many subordinate and tributary nations seems like solemn trifling. Surely it was possible for a prophet, especially such a prophet as Isaiah, to say that, though the whole world were to league itself together, it could do no more than God by His counsel had before ordained should be done. And that is really all the verses say, and they say it after a vivid and concrete fashion.

[26] It has greatly confirmed my opinion as to the date to which ch. xxviii. must be assigned to find that Meinhold in his *Studien* also places it in the period after Ahaz had disappointed the prophet's hopes.

There is nothing in the 'covenant with death and Sheol' (ver. 15) which compels us to assign the oracle to the time when Hezekiah was thinking of entering into a treaty with Egypt against Assyria: the phrase has far more of the character of a proverbial expression which means that the men counted themselves secure against any danger. Men who had leagued themselves with Assyria could use the proverb about their situation, especially after Assyria had justified their confidence by its overthrow of the threatening coalition.

The description of the courtiers as scornful men (ver. 14) and of their attitude to the prophet (vers. 8 ff.) agrees best with what may well have been the tone of Ahaz and his court after the successful issue of their league with Assyria had relieved them from any need to show deference to the words of Isaiah. It does not agree with the tone of the court under Hezekiah.

[27] To cut out vers. 5 f. as a later addition leaves ver. 7 hanging helplessly in the air. 'But these also' of ver. 7 refers back to the remnant which Isaiah had hoped to find in Judah. The prophet then sets their actual condition in the following verses over against what had been his hopes for them and through them. Vers. 5 f. are indispensable in the connection.

[28] קַו לָקָו צַו לָצָו has no esoteric meaning, and its sense does not therefore depend on its translation. The words are monosyllables such as have always been used for teaching children; and any monosyllables might have been selected by the prophet to convey his meaning.

[29] Ver. 18 makes it clear that the covenant with death and Sheol of ver. 15 means their agreement with the power from which their destruction was to be feared. When it came, they boasted to themselves, it could not overwhelm those whose covenant with it secured them from its ravages. But, says Isaiah, your destruction is to come through the power with which you are leagued, and through whose help you count yourselves safe.

[30] This is the sense of ver. 15: 'we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves.' Isaiah's opposition to an alliance with Egypt is never based on the idea that to intrigue with Egypt implies treachery to Assyria, their overlord. Hence there

is no reason to construe the making lies a refuge as a reflection on their treachery.

[31] In ver. 16 read יָבוֹשׁ for יָחִישׁ.

[32] In all probability, the section x. 20–23 has fallen out of place and ought to follow on xxviii. 22: its unsuitability in its present position has been long recognised. When it is restored after xxviii. 22, there is a clear meaning to the difficult phrase of x. 20 which states that Israel shall no longer stay upon its smiter. Isaiah says that, after the chastisement from the very power in which they have trusted for deliverance, Judah shall learn to look away from Assyria, in which they have put a vain reliance, to Jahveh.

The reason which led to the section being misplaced may be that an editor, interpreting the covenant of ver. 15 as referring to Hezekiah's overtures to Egypt, has referred ch. xxviii. to the series of chapters (xxix. ff.) which deal with this period, and then, recognising that x. 20, with its reference to Judah's trust in its smiter, can only be understood of Assyria, has transferred the section to ch. x., which deals with Assyria and the position towards Assyria.

[33] The close connection between x. and xxviii., alike in language and in idea, was noted long ago by Ewald, and was further developed by W. R. Smith, *Prophets*[2], p. 433. This is an additional confirmation of the early date to which ch. xxviii. ought to be assigned. As already stated, I think vers. 20–23 of ch. x. go with ch. xxviii.

[34] It is now certain that Sargon never undertook such a march, and that Isaiah is not describing something which actually happened. The route described was not the route which an invader whose base was at Nineveh was ever likely to take, since it was waterless and barren.

[35] Since the fall of Carchemish referred to in ver. 9 took place in 717, the oracle which speaks of it as a thing of the past must have been uttered some years after the fall of Samaria.

[36] It is possible that the clearer knowledge of what Assyria meant—of its boastful and cruel power, of its insolent disregard for all human rights, of its contempt for every national pride and tie—has lent colour to the prophet's language and vigour to his denunciation; but it is not necessary to suppose that it has done more. There is no reason to suppose that, when Isaiah saw what the conquest of Assyria implied, he changed his view of its future and of the attitude which Jahveh must take towards it. In principle Isaiah says no more than what he has already said in ch. viii. and ch. xxviii.

—that Assyria is in the hands of Jahveh to serve His purposes. Already he had said that it would overflow the land up to the neck —but no farther, because the land belongs to Immanuel. But the sight of this apparently irresistible invader, who robbed the treasures of the nations with the ease with which a boy robs a bird's nest, may have threatened the faith of those who had accepted the prophet's teaching. He felt it necessary to say to them that there were limits to its power.

[37] According to Cheyne, the date was about 720, the death year of Shalmanasar IV.; according to Meinhold, it was rather the year when Tiglath Pileser died. It is sufficient for the purpose of my text to note that it was a year when Nineveh had lost one of its warrior princes, and also the year when King Ahaz, who had never swerved in his submission to Assyria, died. In these circumstances Philistia had a double reason to hope that Judah might join the league.

[38] The date is probably 713–711.

[39] Vers. 6 f. are a later addition. The date is about 705.

[40] Isaiah, like Hosea, is a particularist, so far as the heathen world is concerned. He has no sense of the divine law as something which reveals itself even to the hearts of the nations, like Amos. Instead, he has the sense of the divine purpose which uses the nations for its ends and which chooses whom it will. Hence his one idea of the heathen world is that it through Assyria fulfils Jahveh's purpose on Israel but can have no place for itself in the world-plan. Hence also Messiah is to be on David's throne to establish the kingdom (ix. 6), not to govern the world. The first prophet to hint that the nations may learn and profit from the great act of divine self-manifestation which uses them for its ends is Zephaniah; and Zephaniah is much nearer Amos than Hosea. All the men who emphasise the side of religion which implies a peculiar grace to one nation are apt to fall into difficulties over the question of election.

[41] In connection with the debated question of the Isaianic authorship of these chapters see the recent statement by Nowack, *Die Zukunftshoffnungen Israels in der Assyrischen Zeit*, pp. 49 f. Nowack, in his usual careful and cautious fashion, sums up with the statement that there is nothing in the language or ideas of these oracles which makes it impossible to suppose that they were written by Isaiah. I refer to the discussion of the question here, not merely because it indicates that from the linguistic point of view the

much more definite position I have taken in the text is at least legitimate, but because Nowack throughout his discussion of the oracles insists on a view which seems to me peculiarly valuable and opportune. He insists on the fact that in the exilic and post-exilic period the idea of the Messianic Kingdom had already an established place in the minds of the people, and yet that the period of the exile, when the kingdom had irreparably passed away, was the time when the Messianic hope was least likely to attach itself to the kingdom. Hence it is necessary, in order to account for its presence in the form of the king among the exiles, to suppose that the Messianic Kingdom was already familiar to them in some widely impressive shape. To relegate the prophecies which attach the Messianic hope to the kingdom into the period of the exile is no answer to the difficulty, but merely raises a fresh difficulty.

[42] The text at the close of ch. viii. and the beginning of ch. ix. is hopelessly corrupt, and it is useless to add another to the many attempts at reconstruction, for enough remains to make it clear that it is the people who have walked in darkness who are to see a great light (ix. 1), and that the peace of Messiah's government is only possible after Jahveh has broken the rod of the oppressor (ix. 3). Isaiah has not changed from the view he held when he foretold that the waters of the river were to overflow the land, even up to the neck (viii. 8).

[43] It is unnecessary now to discuss the meaning of the terms in which the coming child is described in ix. 5, since it is generally allowed that the terms employed make it clear that he is to be no mere earthly sovereign. It is, however, useful to note how entirely the fact that this salvation is of the Lord agrees with Isaiah's attitude to every proposal of an alliance of Judah with the rebels against Assyria's power. The two views express the same idea from different sides, and support each other.

[44] A. B. Davidson, *Isaiah* in the *Temple Bible*, pp. xvi f.

[45] Here is the point of attachment for the later doctrine of the resurrection. Since the dead, who died for the faith, must have their share in the consummation, and since the consummation is a kingdom on the earth, those who are asleep in the earth must awake and arise on this earth, not in heaven.

[46] *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*[6], p. 129, n. 2.

[47] Read רֹעִים for ומריא, and read תִּתְרֹעֲעִנָּה.

[48] It is an insufficient explanation of the prophet's attitude to

say, as *e.g.* Wade in the *Westminster Commentary on Isaiah*, p. xxxviii, that the prophets "were poets as well as prophets, and like the poets of every age and race they projected their own emotions outside them and felt that human joys and sorrows were shared by the physical universe about them." For the prophets attached their view to a new intervention of Jahveh : and it is the reason why they felt this in connection with Jahveh's self-manifestation that we need to find.

When König, *Geschichte der ATlichen Religion*, pp. 332 f., says that the kernel of the prophetic predictions as to the completion of the Kingdom of God is to be found in its religious-moral character, he emphasises what is perfectly true. But when he draws the conclusion that such a prophecy in Isaiah is not closely connected with this kernel, he leaves it either as an unexplained accretion to the prophet's picture or as an alien element in his thought. What we want to know is why a prophet who holds so strong an ethico-religious position as Isaiah has admitted it to the prominent position which it holds.

[49] The account belongs to PC, but it is generally recognised now that the fact of a certain account appearing in PC does not necessarily mean that it is as late as the longer record of which it came to make up a part.

[50] The very limitation of this idea to an apparent detail like that of the food of the beasts is an illustration of what it meant to the prophet. Voltaire insisted that the ruin of Lisbon through an earthquake made it impossible to believe in the existence of any moral Governor of the world, because there he believed he saw a nature which ignored all moral considerations. Isaiah could not predict the cessation of all the baneful ruin wrought by nature, because he did not need to. To the Hebrew prophet the earthquake and the storm, the whirlwind and the blight, were not the outcome of nature but direct acts of God, the instruments He used to chastise His people. When God dwelt among a reconciled people, these things ceased at once, because the need for them had passed away. The point which he did press was the point where to him the world-order seemed to be in conflict with the supreme will which governed all things.

[51] Isaiah does not enter into the detailed attack on the social evils of Jerusalem which is to be found in Amos or in his fellow-countryman Micah ; nor does he so frequently or so violently attack the

debased cult as Hosea did. He counts it sufficient to demand that the court shall acknowledge Jahveh, or to say that the people through their leaders have spurned His counsel. No doubt this is partly due to the fact that Isaiah approaches the whole question of the national guilt from a different angle, and views Jahveh's relation to His people as that of Judah's supreme ruler. Yet I cannot but feel that this does not exhaust the situation. Isaiah leaves the impression of speaking as one who can take it for granted that men in Jerusalem know something of what allegiance to Jahveh implies in the direction of brotherhood and seemly justice within the State. And the attitude which Ahaz in ch. vii. felt compelled to take to the prophet seems to indicate that Isaiah had behind him this recognition —an uneasy recognition on the part of the king. Either the work of the earlier prophets had produced some effect, or there was in Judah a deeper sense of how distinctive and fundamentally ethical the Jahveh-religion was.

[52] Smend, *Religionsgeschichte*, p. 227.

CHAPTER VII.

[1] On the difference of the religious views entertained by the official representatives of religion in Northern Israel and Judah see Kautzsch, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, pp. 273 and 275.

[2] Others—*e.g.* Kautzsch, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, pp. 233 f.—see in the Deuteronomic attitude to the sacrifices a much more negative view than that which is here expressed. Apart from the more general considerations in the text, I cannot understand how a code which puts into the forefront of its practical legislation a change in the habits of the people as to their place of sacrifice and a change in the position of the priesthood can be regarded as taking a merely negative attitude to the sacrificial system.

[3] G. Sternberg, *Die Ethik des Deuteronomiums*, p. 64. Cf. also W. R. Smith, *OTJC*[2], p. 365.

[4] "It (Deuteronomy) does not embrace a complete corpus of either the civil or the ceremonial statutes that were in force when it was written: it excerpts such as were, in the author's judgment, most generally necessary for the Israelite to know, and best adapted to exemplify the moral and spiritual principles which it was his main anxiety to see practically recognised in Israel" (Driver, *Comm.*, p. xxvi).

[5] Cf. W. R. Smith, *OTJC*[2], p. 365. Probably the strange laws of xxii. 9–11 owe their presence in the code to some heathen practice of which at present we have no knowledge. For another suggestion as to their origin see Stade, *Biblische Theologie des ATs*, p. 146.

[6] Jer. xvi. 6 refers to this practice, as though no blame attached to it. Perhaps the fact of the custom having a heathen origin had died out of the popular mind, as the origin of such customs, especially those connected with birth and death, is apt to do; and the prophet, who recognised how little real significance attached to the act, was not troubled by its persistence. One may compare how, at a later date, when the connection of the eunuch with a heathen rite was lost and eunuchs were known as servants in the royal courts of the East, Isa. lvi. 3 ff. expressly permitted such poor creatures to enter the קהל. This change, deliberately made in the existing law, proves how, so long as prophecy lived in old Israel, men were not afraid to go behind the letter of their law and frame new regulations which conserved its spirit.

[7] Because this practice did involve the deliberate acknowledgment of another power than Jahveh, it was never able to come to a *modus vivendi* with the Jahveh-faith.

[8] W. R. Smith, *OTJC*[2], p. 366.

[9] It is, *e.g.*, uncertain why so large a number were forbidden, and how the lawful came to be defined by the principle which separated them from the unclean. Probably the different clans had come into contact with different forms of worship, and had contracted a religious aversion to the use of the animals employed in the rituals which they knew. When, therefore, the practices of the several clans were codified into a law which was to govern all Israel, the number of animals forbidden to the worshippers of Jahveh was greatly increased.

Steuernagel (*Comm. on Deut.*, p. xvii) on literary grounds pronounces xiv. 3–20 an addition dating from the time of the exile, but gives no reason for its insertion. Here, it is true, our ignorance of the rituals of Canaanite religion leaves us uncertain as to whether all the forbidden beasts were actually used in such worship; but the fact that Ezekiel (ix. 10), writing from the exile, blames the community of Jerusalem for the ritual use of forbidden beasts, and that a post-exilic prophet (Isa. lxvi. 3, 17) speaks of such practices in Jerusalem, points rather to such rules having been framed for use in Palestine itself.

[10] The same thing is true as to the hygienic reasons for avoiding such food. Prof. Ramsay (*The Revolution in Constantinople and Turkey*, p. 199) is of opinion that the motions of the Turks at prayer form an admirable calisthenic exercise; but no one, Prof. Ramsay least of all, would suggest that Mohammedans adopted them for that reason. There is as little justification for seeking a reason for the forbidden animals of Israel in the wholesomeness or unwholesomeness of their flesh.

[11] Cf. Lehmann-Haupt, *Israel*, p. 93; Küchler, *Die Stellung des Propheten Jesaia zur Politik seiner Zeit*, pp. 21 f.

It deserves attention that here the Deuteronomists, with their sense of the distinctive character of Israel's religion, came into contact with and were aided by the new stirring of national characteristics and the deepened recognition of the worth of nationality which showed themselves after the collapse of the Assyrian power. The Assyrians, who had outraged every national feeling and had trampled on every national religion, had roused in the little peoples whom they had overwhelmed a new sense of the worth of the nationality of which they had been deprived and for which many of them had fought to the death. Gunkel (*Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen*, p. 11) admirably compares the situation with the patriotic uprising of Europe after the fall of Napoleon, and points out how, not only in Israel but in Egypt, men were seeking to build up again the old things which Assyria had ruthlessly cast down.

[12] Cf. Bertholet, *Die Stellung der Israeliten und Juden zu den Fremden*.

[13] On the ground that, so long as Judah was living within its own land, there was no need to determine the attitude of the people towards the נָכְרִי, the foreigner proper, as contrasted with the גֵּר, Steuernagel (*Comm.* p. xvii) cuts out passages like xiv. 21, xv. 3, xvii. 15, xxiii. 21, which refer to the נָכְרִי, and relegates them to the period of the exile. The position fails to recognise how totally the situation had already been altered at the time when Deuteronomy was framed. Northern Israel was largely peopled by foreign settlers, and, after Sennacherib's conquests, even Judah was no longer free from them. The fact to which Steuernagel draws attention, that some of these passages have the appearance of being additions and are easily separated from the context, may be due to their having been framed by the Deuteronomists to meet this new situation; but it must

always be remembered, in dealing with a sporadic code like Deuteronomy, that the connection between successive laws is inevitably loose.

[14] Cf. A. Loisy, *The Religion of Israel*, p. 176.

[15] To represent the Israelites before the conquest as united by their religion but not possessed of any common sanctuary is to think of them as having reached a higher conception of the spirituality of religion than I can see just ground for supposing. The tabernacle of the wilderness has been assimilated to the temple by the piety of a later generation; but its existence as the centre of the worship of the nation in the early period seems necessary.

[16] On the clans as *Kultgenossenschaften* consult Stade, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, pp. 39 f., and the literature there referred to. I cannot but think that Stade underestimated the proofs of and the necessity for a faith which united the tribes at the period of the conquest; but I recognise that to this result his view of the conquest and of the process by which the nation of Israel was built up inevitably led. Our views part company earlier than here, and therefore we construe the phenomena of the history from a different angle.

It is said in the text that religion was reckoned as the chief of the necessities of common life for which the clan provided. Another necessity for which the tribal community provided was the administration of local justice through the זְקֵנִים and the priests at the sanctuary. And here, in the clash between the clan morality with its local officials and the new morality which was necessary for the unified kingdom (which has been already referred to, pp. 51 f.), one sees the same process taking place in the more secular field which takes place in religious worship in Deuteronomy. The period was one of a necessary centralisation on all the lines of the national life.

[17] It is not without significance that even in the rudest time the people showed themselves conscious of the risk which their situation involved. Now, says Micah in the period of the conquest of the country, I know that the Lord will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest (Judg. xvii. 13). And the Danites are prepared to bribe a suitable officiant to come with them to their new settlement (Judg. xviii. 19).

[18] Cf. Driver, *Comm. on Deut.*, p. lix: "The law of the single sanctuary is not an end in itself, it is but a means, propounded (xii. 2 ff.) for the purpose of securing the same end."

[19] Cf. Wellhausen, *Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Judas* in *Erstes Heft der Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (1884), p. 18.

[20] This conclusion is just, though one should accept Steuernagel's opinion (*Comm.*, *ad loc.*) that this law came from a different author. It has been admitted into the code, whatever be its source; and the Deuteronomists could not have admitted it had the unity of the sanctuary been a principle with them.

[21] W. R. Smith, *OTJC*[2], pp. 245 ff. See the whole section, which is peculiarly suggestive and valuable.

[22] That one who offered his sacrifice could still approach the altar and personally lay his gift upon it is apparent still through the ritual prescription of xxvi. 1 ff. It is not necessary to prove the fact here; I can refer the student to any good modern commentary.

[23] The writers who edited the historical books from the Deuteronomic point of view lay great stress on the fact that certain kings did not observe the law commanding the destruction of the high places, and so seem to place the rule as to the central sanctuary much higher than I have placed it in the text. Even if we must allow that they intended to make this single act the measure of the good or ill conduct of Israel's former rulers, we have always with us the type of man who fastens on an outward characteristic of a great reform, and judges the past by whether this outward form has been correctly observed or not. Church History is full of illustrations of the harm which easily-learned criteria as to ritual and doctrine have done to little men.

But I see no reason for burdening the editors with such a misconception of a great movement. They may simply have used this convenient phrase as a useful method of marking how certain kings in Israel were not in the line of progress which culminated in the reform of Deuteronomy. Church History is full of warnings against being too ready to conclude that men were little, even when they fastened on what seems a little thing to us to-day. These men may have seen that the centralisation of the worship stood for a great thing, a thing much wider than itself.

[24] W. R. Smith, *OTJC*[2], pp. 346 f.

[25] Cf., for the proof of this, p. 220, *infra.*

[26] Cf. Sternberg, *Die Ethik des Deuteronomiums*, pp. 28 f.

[27] Cf. Kraetzschmar, *Die Bundesvorstellung im alten Israel*, pp. 142 f.; and Valeton, *ZATW*, xii. p. 251.

[28] Cf. Driver, *Comm. on Deut.*, p. lxix. The fact of the writer sometimes speaking as though those who stood at Moab were identical

with those who received the law at Horeb has been used as a proof of a difference in the point of view which implies a different authorship. The position is precarious. The book is much too strongly marked by the desire to express great truths in the form of symbol, and the writer is too willing to bend historic facts in order to enforce religious truths to leave one quite secure about such a matter-of-fact method of dealing with his statements. Hosea had already personified the nation as the recipient of the divine favour and the preserver of the divine purpose; and in these matters Deuteronomy is saturated with Hosea's thought.

[29] This chapter is the one which shows the clearest evidence of having been expanded at a later date. Had these views, therefore, been confined to ch. iv., one would have felt a hesitation about ascribing them to the reformers who drafted the code. But, since they appear in other chapters of the book, I feel no difficulty in supposing that they have been more articulately and clearly embodied by a later writer of the same school, to whom we owe ch. iv. in its present form.

[30] Cf. Sternberg, *Die Ethik des Deuteronomiums*, pp. 11 ff.

[31] For an interesting comparison and contrast with the code of Hammurabi cf. Kleinert, *Die Profeten Israels in sozialer Beziehung*, p. 76.

[32] In such a position, far more than in isolated texts, is seen how fundamental to the thought of Deuteronomy is the conception of Jahveh as the God and Ruler of the whole world: cf. p. 216, *supra.*

[33] Hence it is easy to understand why there is no mention of the king in connection with warfare, although the king at the beginning was elected from the people as the leader in war (1 Sam. viii. 20).

Behind all this lies the earlier conception which made the war of Jahveh appear as an uninterrupted practice of the religious cult, for which see Kautzsch, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, p. 77, and more particularly the careful study of F. Schwally, "Semitische Kriegsalterthümer," *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel.* But, while this older idea explains the expulsion from the camp of those who have contracted a ritual uncleanness, and while it may once—probably did once—supply a different motive for sending home the men who were newly married (see Marti. *Comm.*, *ad loc.*), it would be unsafe to conclude that the Deuteronomists, when they continued some of the older practices, continued them with the

old motives. They supplied new motives for the observance of the sabbath law, and were quite capable of supplying new motives for the law of war.

[34] Scotsmen are irresistibly reminded of the procedure at Bothwell Bridge and Dunbar, when their Presbyterian forefathers were eager to purge out the malignants in order that the army might be rendered a fitting instrument in the hands of the Lord, with whom they had entered into a covenant. It was of God's mercy to Israel that the lesson followed soon, even as it was of God's peculiar mercy to Scotland that the defeat at Bothwell Bridge was not delayed. The situation is the more suggestive and interesting, because the Scots were also working on the conception of the covenanted nation, and of a covenant so external that they believed it possible to force it on reluctant England, and valuable after they had so imposed it.

[35] Cf. our Lord's attitude to the sabbath law.

The motive supplied by Deuteronomy for the keeping of the Sabbath seems to me later than that of the decalogue in Exodus, simply because it is social and not religious, and because it avoids the naïve anthropomorphism of the divine rest on the seventh day. Even if the present form of the decalogue in Exodus is due to the Priestly Code, the author has gone back to the earlier idea because it can better serve his underlying conception.

[36] Cf. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*[6], pp. 135 ff.

[37] It is an interesting parallel to note how, when the industrial revolution took place in Britain which altered the old relations in which masters and servants had stood, men like Ruskin and Carlyle turned to glorify the old order which had a moral basis they could understand, and shrank from the new order which had not yet evolved the moral basis without which they recognised that it could produce little beyond confusion. How much we have lost with all the 'progress' of the past fifty years, and how much need there is for a new moral basis to our new economic conditions, it is not necessary to state.

[38] "It is assumed (in Ex. xxii. 25) that no one borrows money except for personal distress, and all interest is conceived as usury: Ps. xv. 5" (W. R. Smith, *OTJC*[2], p. 350).

[39] Thus the Koran forbids all usury: "Allah has permitted sale but prohibited usury" (Sura ii. 276; cf. iii. 125). The Arabic tradition bears witness that the taking of interest was already forbidden in

the older religion (cf. Hejcl, *Das ATliche Zinsverbot*, pp. 12 f.). Now the conditions of early Arabic life were very similar to those which prevailed in early Israel.

[40] See Buhl, *Die socialen Verhältnisse der Israeliten*, pp. 97 ff., but compare more particularly an interesting study of the question, J. Hejcl, *Das Alttestamentliche Zinsverbot.*

The author is embarrassed by the fact that his church (he is a Roman Catholic) has forbidden usury in the same broad terms as Deuteronomy did. But this only adds to the interest of his pamphlet, since it suggests the difficulties which have attended and always must attend the effort to make binding on the consciences of men in all time regulations which were the outcome of a high moral purpose, but were fitted only for the conditions which prevailed in one particular time.

[41] They appear again in Jeremiah's prophecy (xxxv. 1–11), and it is interesting to notice the attitude which the prophet, because he is a prophet, takes to them. He holds them up to the men of his time as an illustration of faithfulness to a little thing in order to rebuke his people's faithlessness in a big thing. One feels that there is a touch of sympathetic patronage in Jeremiah's attitude to this little company, who cling with pathetic loyalty to a little prescription which they have received from the past, but who have no real sense of its place in the larger life of the community. Jeremiah's attitude is the natural attitude of a man who knows he has hold of a large movement fruitful in positive content toward a thing which has stood for a great deal but has outlived its meaning.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES.

GENESIS.

	PAGE
i.	185
vi. 8	246
viii. 21	246
xii. 7	8, 15, 18
xii. 8	16
xiii. 4	16
xiii. 13	27
xv.	18
xv. 12	45
xviii. 1	12
xix.	27
xix. 24	11
xx. 3	24
xx. 12	26
xxi. 33	10, 14, 16
xxii.	18, 20, 246, 247
xxii. 8	9
xxii. 14	9
xxvi. 23–25	12
xxvi. 25	14
xxviii. 12	10
xxviii. 16	15
xxviii. 18	18
xxviii. 19	12
xxxi. 13	9, 10
xxxi. 14–16	26
xxxi. 34	207
xxxi. 43 f.	26
xxxi. 50 f.	24
xxxi. 54	9
xxxii.	267
xxxii. 1	26
xxxii. 2 f.	12
xxxii. 31	12
xxxiii. 18–20	13
xxxiii. 20	9
xxxiv.	27
xxxv. 4	22
xxxv. 7	9, 15, 18
xxxv. 14	14

GENESIS—*continued.*

	PAGE
xxxix. 9	24
xli. 25–32	11
xli. 45	9
xliii. 32	9
xlviii. 5	17
xlix. 5–7	27

EXODUS.

i. 20 f.	24
iii. 8	10
iii. 12	277
v. 1	17
ix. 8	11
xvii. 15	9
xviii. 19	30
xix. 11	10
xix. 18	10
xx. 24	10, 14
xx. 23–26	31
xxi. 6	30
xxii. 5	274
xxii. 10	31
xxii. 17	40
xxii. 25	291
xxiii. 14–19	31
xxxiv.	214, 215

NUMBERS.

x. 35	252
xxiii. 21	251
xxiii. 23	41

DEUTERONOMY.

i. 6	218
i. 19 ff.	218
i. 26 ff.	218
i. 28–30	222

DEUTERONOMY—*continued.*	PAGE
i. 42	220
ii. 12	222
ii. 24	222
iii. 6	222
iii. 21 f.	222
iv.	193, 219, 290
iv. 7	216
iv. 13 f.	219
iv. 32 ff.	216
iv. 35	216
iv. 38	222
iv. 39	216
v. 2	217, 218
v. 3	201, 217
v. 6	196
v. 12–15	196, 226
v. 14 f.	264
vi. 1–15	202
vi. 4	216
vi. 10	217
vi. 16–25	202
vi. 19	220
vii.	202
vii. 1–4	205, 222
vii. 6 f.	216
vii. 8 f.	204
vii. 8	217
vii. 9	216
vii. 16–24	222
viii.	202
viii. 20	222
ix.	202, 217
ix. 1–5	222
ix. 21	121
x.	202
x. 15	216
x. 17	216
x. 21	216
xi.	202
xi. 23–25	222
xi. 31	217
xii. 2 ff.	288
xii. 3	16
xii. 12	226
xii. 13–19	209
xii. 18	226
xii. 20 ff.	211
xii. 27	209
xii. 30	203, 222
xiii.	9
xiii. 1–5	47
xiii. 2–6	203
xiii. 6–11	227
xiii. 7–12	203
xiii. 12–18	227

DEUTERONOMY—*continued.*	PAGE
xiii. 13–19	203
xiv. 1	204
xiv. 2	216
xiv. 3–20	204, 286
xiv. 21	204, 287
xiv. 22–28	210
xiv. 28 f.	210
xv. 3	287
xvi.	209
xvi. 1–17	197
xvi. 11	210, 226
xvi. 14	210, 226
xvi. 21	204, 211
xvi. 22	204
xvii. 2	217
xvii. 8 ff.	199
xvii. 11	269
xvii. 14–20	198
xvii. 15	220, 287
xvii. 18–20	198
xvii. 19	220
xviii. 9–13	40
xviii. 9–20	204
xviii. 10	20
xviii. 2	222
xviii. 13	204
xviii. 14 ff.	41, 204
xviii. 20–22	47
xviii. 21 f.	37
xix. 1	222
xix. 14	228
xx. 1–9	221
xx. 4	220
xx. 10–15	221
xx. 13	220
xx. 16–18	205, 222
xx. 19 f.	221
xxi. 10	220
xxi. 10 ff.	207
xxii. 5	204
xxii. 9–11	286
xxiii. 2	204
xxiii. 10–15	221
xxiii. 15	220, 222
xxiii. 18 f.	204
xxiii. 20 f.	229
xxiii. 21	287
xxiv. 10–13	229
xxvi. 1–11	197, 209, 217, 238, 289
xxvi. 2	226
xxvi. 12	226
xxvi. 17 f.	218
xxvi. 18 f.	216
xxviii. 7	220
xxxi. 3–6	222

DEUTERONOMY—*continued.*

	PAGE
xxxi. 10-12	210
xxxi. 16	217
xxxi. 20	217
xxxiii. 5	2
xxxiii. 8	42
xxxiii. 10	30
xxxiv. 10	250

JOSHUA.

iv. 19 ff.	12
v. 2-9	12
vii. 11	217
vii. 15	217
xxiii. 16	217

JUDGES.

ii. 1	217
ii. 20	217
iv. 8	36
v. 5	10, 11
vi. 24	9
xvii.	29
xvii. 13	288
xviii. 19	30, 288
xviii. 30	30
xxi. 19	12

1 SAMUEL.

i.	249
i. 3	12, 252
ii. 25	30
iii.	250
iii. 1	251
iii. 1-3	251
iii. 3	252
iii. 14	19
iv. 3	252
iv. 7	252
iv. 22	44
viii. 20	290
ix. 6	45
ix. 9	43, 250
ix. 13	31
x. 5	31
x. 5 f.	45, 250
x. 6	2
x. 10	31
x. 17-24	118
xi. 15	118
xiii. 8-14	29
xiv. 32-35	29
xiv. 37 ff.	42

1 SAMUEL—*continued.*

	PAGE
xiv. 52	52
xv. 32 f.	254
xvi.	31
xvi. 13	2
xviii. 10	253
xix. 18	31
xix. 18 f.	250
xx. 8	270
xxiii. 9 ff.	42
xxiv. 20	248
xxvi. 19	19
xxviii. 9	40

2 SAMUEL.

iii. 39	248
v. 24	15
viii. 17 f.	194
xv. 23-29	253
xx. 23	52
xx. 25	194
xxi. 1-9	19
xxiv. 11	254
xxiv. 13	38
xxiv. 15	11
xxiv. 25	19

1 KINGS.

i. 9	14
iii. 4 ff.	13
viii. 5	29
viii. 55	29
xi. 4	23
xi. 26 ff.	253
xi. 31 ff.	2
xii. 1	13
xii. 25	13
xii. 31 ff.	194
xvi. 24	13
xviii. 28, 36	46
xix. 14	217
xxi.	254
xxii. 8	49

2 KINGS.

ii. 3	31
ii. 5	31
iii. 15	45
iii. 27	20, 263
iv. 23	32
iv. 38	31
ix. 3	2
ix. 11	45

2 KINGS—*continued.*

PAGE

x. 5-11 265
xi. 194
xiv. 25 257
xv. 8 104
xv. 29 266
xvi. 9-16 205
xvii. 15 217
xvii. 35 217
xvii. 38 217
xxiii. 21-23 208

ISAIAH.

i. 10-17 187
i. 26 f. 180, 187
ii. 6-22 . . 151, 152, 275, 279
ii. 8 145
ii. 12-17 152
ii. 20 145
ii. 21 151
iii. 8 274
v. 1-7 152
v. 7 151
v. 8 ff. 276
v. 25-30 . . . . . 152, 276
v. 27-30 153
vi. . . . . 66 ff.
vi. 1-8 149
vi. 9 275
vi. 9-13 . . 149, 150, 154, 274
vi. 13 274
vii. 160 ff., 165, 167, 172, 274, 285
vii. 2 160
vii. 4 160
vii. 9 161
vii. 11 161
vii. 13 277
vii. 14 277
vii. 15 278
vii. 16 . . . . . 277, 278
vii. 17, 20 278
vii. 22 278
viii. 166, 172, 281
viii. 1-4 160
viii. 4 166
viii. 6 279
viii. 8 283
viii. 9 f. 279
viii. 11 ff. 279
viii. 14 257
viii. 16 . . . . . 167, 171
viii. 17 167
ix. . . . . 180 ff.
ix. 1. 283
ix. 1 ff. 184

ISAIAH—*continued.*

PAGE

ix. 3 . . . . . 181, 283
ix. 5 283
ix. 6 282
ix. 7 151
ix. 7–x. 4 276
x. 5-9 172
x. 5-15 172
x. 5-19 172
x. 6 172
x. 7 178
x. 9 281
x. 11 172
x. 20 281
x. 20-23 281
x. 24-34 172
x. 28-32 172
x. 33 f. 172
xi. . . . . 180 ff.
xi. 1 181
xi. 1 ff. 184
xiv. 24-27 173
xiv. 28-32 174
xiv. 32 171
xvii. 6 152
xvii. 12-14. 174
xviii. 66
xviii. 1-5 175
xviii. 6 f. 282
xx. 174
xxii. 1-14 177
xxii. 15-19. 52
xxviii. . . 168 ff., 172, 178, 280
xxviii. 1-4. 169
xxviii. 5 169
xxviii. 5 f. 280
xxviii. 7 280
xxviii. 8 ff. . . . 168, 280
xxviii. 10 169
xxviii. 13 169
xxviii. 14 280
xxviii. 15 . . . 169, 280, 281
xxviii. 16 . . 169, 170, 173, 281
xxviii. 17 f. 170
xxviii. 18 280
xxviii. 20 170
xxviii. 21 171
xxviii. 22 281
xxx. 27-33. 176
xxxi. 176
xxxi. 1 f. 144
xxxi. 3 176
xxxi. 8 176
xxxiv. 8 257
xli. 21 f. 37
xliv. 7, 26 ff. 37

ISAIAH—*continued.*

	PAGE
xlv. 21	37
lvi. 3 ff.	286
lxi. 2	257
lxiii. 4	257
lxvi. 3, 17	286

JEREMIAH.

v. 4 f.	269
xvi. 6	286
xix. 4 f.	247
xxvi. 17 ff.	157
xxxv. 1–11	292

EZEKIEL.

ix. 10	286

HOSEA.

i.	100
i. 2	101, 102, 265
i. 3–5	119
i. 4	104, 265, 268
ii. 5 ff.	129, 140
ii. 7	113
ii. 10 f.	109, 116
ii. 13	263
ii. 14	116
ii. 15	263
ii. 16–18	141, 272
ii. 17	108
ii. 18–20	105
ii. 20	141
ii. 20 f.	111
ii. 20–25	272
ii. 23 ff.	106, 143
iii.	100
iii. 1	125, 140
iii. 4	108, 137, 268, 269
iv.	99, 120
iv. 1	114, 123, 215
iv. 1–3	105
iv. 1–8	31
iv. 2	124
iv. 6	110, 114, 121
iv. 8	121, 270
iv. 11 ff.	114
iv. 15	13
iv. 16	112
v. 1	31, 98, 120, 122, 266, 268, 269
v. 1 ff.	120
v. 6	127
v. 10	119, 268

HOSEA—*continued.*

	PAGE
v. 13	98, 107, 115, 139
v. 14	106, 107
vi. 1–3	131, 271
vi. 4	114
vi. 5	110, 269
vi. 6	129
vi. 7	98, 265
vi. 8	98, 266
vi. 9	13, 98, 122
vi. 10	113
vii. 1–7	139, 269
vii. 3 ff.	268
vii. 5	98
vii. 7	119
vii. 8	116
vii. 11	59, 112, 114, 115, 119, 266
vii. 12	107
vii. 15	114
vii. 16	268
viii.	120
viii. 4	110, 119, 268
viii. 5 f.	126
viii. 8	116
viii. 9	98, 115, 266
viii. 10	111
viii. 12	114, 121
viii. 13	107, 110, 261, 272
viii. 14	110
ix.	99, 137
ix. 1	28, 110, 111, 125
ix. 3	106, 109, 110, 127
ix. 3 f.	108
ix. 3–6	272
ix. 4	127, 129
ix. 5	127, 265
ix. 6	106
ix. 7	45
ix. 9	118, 268
ix. 10	109, 113, 118
ix. 12	107, 137
ix. 14	137
ix. 15	110, 268
ix. 15–17	103
ix. 17	108, 113, 137, 272
x. 1	125
x. 2	125
x. 3	119, 139, 268
x. 5 f.	266
x. 6	106, 140
x. 7	269
x. 8	127
x. 9	118, 269
x. 9 f.	103
x. 10	107
x. 11	112

HOSEA—*continued.*

	PAGE
x. 12 f.	264
x. 13–15	103
x. 14 f.	271
x. 15	269
xi.	139
xi. 1	108, 109, 110, 196, 261
xi. 3	109, 110
xi. 4	266
xi. 5	106, 113, 266, 271
xi. 8	139
xi. 11	106
xii. 1	114
xii. 2	98
xii. 4–7	108, 131, 267, 271
xii. 7	264
xii. 10	108, 110, 137
xii. 13 f.	267
xii. 14	250
xiii. 4	108
xiii. 10	119, 139
xiii. 10 ff.	269
xiii. 14	137, 271
xiv.	272
xiv. 3	129
xiv. 4	141
xiv. 5	272
xiv. 5 ff.	141
xiv. 7 f.	143
xiv. 9	141
xiv. 10	272

JOEL.

iv. 16	258

AMOS.

i.	261, 262
i. 1	256, 257
i. 2	68, 69, 256, 257
i. 3	60
i. 3–5	64
i. 4	67, 68
i. 5	77, 258
i. 6–8	64
i. 7	67, 68
i. 9 f.	64
i. 10	68, 257
i. 11 f.	64
i. 12	67, 68
i. 13	60
i. 13–15	64
i. 14	67, 68, 70
ii. 1–3	64

AMOS—*continued.*

	PAGE
ii. 2	67, 68
ii. 4 f.	64
ii. 7 f.	210
ii. 9 ff.	78, 84
ii. 10	63, 64, 83
ii. 11	36, 83
ii. 12	84
ii. 13	258
ii. 13–16	67
ii. 14–16	78
iii. 1	63, 64, 151
iii. 1 f.	76
iii. 2	82, 84, 196
iii. 7	37, 80
iii. 8	94
iii. 9	85
iii. 12	78, 80, 152
iii. 15.	78
iv. 2	145
iv. 4 f.	88, 245
iv. 6 ff.	38
iv. 6–13	84
iv. 12	84
v.	87
v. 2 f.	78
v. 5	12, 13, 89
v. 15	78, 79
v. 16 f.	78
v. 18	62, 82
v. 19	87
v. 21–23	87
v. 25	83, 87, 264
v. 26	264
v. 27	77, 78
vi.	86
vi. 1	59, 64, 82, 257
vi. 3	62
vi. 8	145
vi. 11	257
vi. 13	59
vi. 14	63, 78
vii. 1	68
vii. 1–3	38
vii. 1–6	63, 81
vii. 4	67, 68, 70
vii. 4–6	38
vii. 7	63
vii. 8	80, 82
vii. 14	59, 256
vii. 15	82, 274
vii. 17	77
viii.	86
viii. 2	82
viii. 5	86
viii. 8	67

Amos—*continued.*

	PAGE
viii. 9	67
ix. 1–8*a*	68
ix. 2	67
ix. 3	67, 257
ix. 7	63, 77
ix. 8*b* ff.	261

Micah.

iii. 12	157
vi. 7	20, 247
vi. 8	264
vii. 14	266

Zephaniah.

i.	65, 76

Malachi.

	PAGE
ii. 1–6	31

Psalms.

xv. 5	291
civ. 27	251

Ecclesiastes.

vii. 26	276

St. Matthew.

vi. 24	127
vii. 22	127
xxviii. 8	216

Acts.

xi. 27 ff.	39
xxi. 10 f.	39
xxvii. 22–26	39

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Abel, 16.
Abiathar, 194.
Abimelech, 24, 26, 27.
Abraham, 8, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 45, 217, 238, 246, 250, 260.
Absalom, 3, 253.
Adadnirari IV., 75.
Adam, 260.
Agabus, 39.
Agag, 254.
Ahab, 4, 49, 54 f., 117, 158, 193, 231, 253, 254, 255.
Ahaz, 153 f., 158 f., 161, 168, 179, 189, 205, 274, 282, 285.
Ahaziah, 55.
Ahijah, 253.
Amaziah, 62 f., 93, 168, 264, 274.
Ammon, 64, 65, 76, 261.
Amorites, 36, 78, 83, 87, 94.
Amos, general, 37, 101, 145, 164, 196, 263.
  personal history, 59, 256.
  period, 59 f.
  addresses all Israel, 63.
  the nations, 64, 92.
  world-judgment, 66 ff., 106.
  never mentions Assyria, 75, 95, 106.
  captivity in, 77 f.
  remnant, 78 f., 262.
  future of Israel, 79.
  no mystic, 80.
  sin of Israel, 81, 84, 91 f.
  Israel's relation to Jahveh, 76, 83 f.
  estimate of prophecy, 36, 83 f., 93 f.
  and the cult, 22, 85 ff., 103, 210, 249.
  covenant, 263.
  conservative, 264.
  prediction of future, 37.
  ethics, 73 f., 76, 84 f., 91 f., 95.
Amos, universal religion, 79, 90 f., 95, 133, 189, 233 f., 262.
  and JE, 17, 22, 71 f., 249.
  and Hosea, 91, 101, 106, 110, 114, 124, 133, 138, 260, 261.
  and Isaiah. *See* under Isaiah.
  and Zephaniah, 65 f., 76 f., 282.
  and Deuteronomy, 218, 224, 232 ff.
Amulets, 204.
Animals, clean and unclean, 204, 286 f.
Arabah, 257.
Ark, 43, 236, 252 f.
Arpad, 75.
Ashdod, 174.
Asherim, 16, 204, 245.
Assyria, 59, 65, 153, 265 f., 282, 287. *See* Nineveh.
  in Amos, 75, 95, 106.
  in Hosea, 106, 115, 119, 139, 271.
  in Isaiah, 158, 166, 169, 171, 278, 279, 281.
Astarte, 10, 204.
Athaliah, 55, 194.

Baal and Baalism, 10, 46, 55, 113, 116, 125, 129, 140, 193, 225, 237, 246, 255. *See* also Canaanite.
Baal Peor, 113.
Babylon, 240, 261, 263.
Babylonian records, 163 f., 246, 259, 262 f.
Balaam, 41, 251.
Baldness for dead, 204, 286.
Bamah. *See* Sanctuary and Canaanite.
Ban, 254.
Barak, 36.
Bashan, 152.
Bathsheba, 254.
Beersheba, 10, 12.
Bethel in JE, 10, 12, 15, 18, 31, 244, 245.

Bethel, Amos at, 59, 62, 63, 89, 168, 249.
in Hosea, 93, 108, 267.
Bothwell Bridge, 291.
Bride, Israel Jahveh's, 109 f., 111 f., 115 f., 117, 125, 132, 134, 207, 267.

Cain, 16.
Calf-worship, 121, 126, 140.
Calno, 173, 174.
Canaanite, sanctuary, 12, 31.
prophecy, 34 f., 46, 71, 250.
religion, 200, 248 f., 259, 286. *See* also Baalism.
extermination of, 205 ff.
Caphtor, 82, 84, 94, 110.
Carchemish, 173, 174, 281.
Carites, 52.
Carmel, Elijah at, 56, 255.
Amos and, 69, 257, 258.
Census, 19, 254.
Chaldia, 75.
Church, in Hosea, 134.
in Isaiah, 189.
in Jeremiah, 239.
Communion, the Holy, 219.
Covenant, in Amos, 263.
in Hosea, 141.
early, 270.
in Deuteronomy, 201, 217.
in Jeremiah, 135, 239.
in Priestly Code, 260.
the Scottish, 291.
Cultus, in JE, 16 ff.
in early Israel, 29 ff.
in Amos, 85 ff. *See* also Amos.
in Hosea, 124 ff. *See* also Hosea.
in Deuteronomy, 195 f., 224 ff.
of North and South compared, 193 f.
Cush, 175. *See* also Ethiopians.
Cyrus, 263.

Damascus, 49, 60 f., 64, 66, 78, 153, 160, 205, 279. *See* also Syrians.
Daniel, 188, 244.
Danites, 288.
David, 3, 15, 19, 38, 42, 44, 49, 50, 52, 53, 194, 252, 254, 270.
house of, 2, 117, 277.
Day of the Lord, 62 f., 65 f., 72 f., 76, 82, 87, 151 f., 164, 275.
Deborah, 36.
Decalogue, 44, 124, 196, 201, 227, 270, 291.
Deutero-Isaiah, 37, 156.
Deuteronomy, general, 37, 40, 41, 44, 46, 90.
composition of book, 192 f.
a reform, 193–97.
relation to prophets, 194 ff., 227 ff., 233 ff.
legislation incomplete, 197; sporadic, 199.
Israel, unique, 202; united, 219; a brotherhood, 210, 224.
no idolatry, 203; no intercourse with heathen, 205; the *gerim*, 206, 209.
Jahveh, Almighty, 216 f., 220.
Covenant, 201, 217.
Cult, 195, 224 ff., 285.
Festivals, 209, 237 f.
nationalises, 208 f., and centralises worship, 210.
how Mosaic, 213 f.
laws of war, 220 ff.; of usury, 229 ff.
only national religion, 91, 231 ff.
and Amos, 218, 224, 232 ff.
and Hosea, 130 f., 196, 216, 218, 224, 232 ff., 290.
and Isaiah, 196, 222, 232 ff.
and Jeremiah, 232, 239.
and Ezekiel, 232, 237.

Edom, 64, 261.
Egypt, in Hosea, 59, 106, 112, 115, 261, 272.
in Isaiah, 144, 176, 280, 281.
Egyptian prophets, 71, 259.
Eli, 19, 30, 251.
Elijah, 37, 46, 49, 54, 55 ff., 148, 253, 254, 256, 260.
Elilim, 145.
Elisha, 37, 78, 253, 256.
Ephraim, use of in Hosea, 266.
Eschatology, 71 ff. *See* under Day of the Lord and Intervention.
Esdraelon, 61, 208.
Eshmunazar, monument of, 273.
Ethics of early Israel, 25 f.
of JE, 23 f., 26.
of Amos, 73, 81, 84, 92, 95.
of Hosea, 113 f., 132 ff.
of Isaiah, 146 ff, 165, 180 f., 185 f.
of Deuteronomy, 216, 223 f., 237 ff.
Ethiopia, 65, 76, 77. *See* also Cush.
Eunuch, 204, 286.
Exodus, the, 17, 87, 217.
Ezekiel, 32, 232, 237, 286.

Faith, in Isaiah, 161, 167, 171, 178, 188 ff., 234.
in Jeremiah, 240.
Festivals, 18, 30, 32, 196 f., 209 f., 225, 237, 249, 263 f.

Gad, 38, 46, 254.
Galilee, 208, 266.
Gaza, 67.
Ger, 206, 209, 287.
Gezer, 13.
Gibeah, 31, 118, 131, 268 f.
Gibeon, 13, 29.
Gibeonites, 19.
Gideon, 183.
Gilead, 98, 266.
Gilgal, 12, 31, 89, 118, 131, 215.
Go'im. *See* Nations.
Golden Age, 141 ff., 185.
Gomer, 100, 101, 102, 271.
Grace of God, 19, 22, 41, 108 f., 122 f., 131, 135 f., 217, 224, 246.
Greek religion, 21, 260.
Gressmann, 71, 142, 248.

Hagar, 25.
Hamath, 63.
Hammurabi, 290.
Hannah, 249.
Hazael, 67, 78, 256. *See* also Damascus and Syria.
Heathen. *See* Nations.
Hesed, 123, 264, 273. *See* also Grace.
Hezekiah, 175, 177, 277, 280, 281.
Holiness, 145 f., 147, 204, 273.
Hope, in Isaiah, 154 ff.
Horeb, 57, 213, 217, 218, 256, 290.
Horse-flesh, 204.
Hosea, general, 28, 37, 45, 246, 275.
difficulty of book, 97 ff.
personal history, 100 ff., 131 f.
period, 104, 266, 271 f.
intervention of Jahveh, 105, 133, 136, 139, 141 ff.
Egypt in. *See* Egypt.
Assyria in. *See* Assyria.
love of Jahveh, 108 ff., 115, 117, 123, 131 f., 135 f., 139, 141.
sin, 91, 107, 113 ff., 132 f.
and the kingdom, 117 ff., 268.
the priesthood, 103 f., 120 ff.
the cult, 124 ff., 132, 143.
remnant, 138.
future of Israel, 136 ff.
universal religion, 133, 234 f.
the nations, 111, 142, 273, 282.
Hosea, the Church in, 134.
and JE, 131 f., 248 f.
and Amos. *See* Amos.
and Isaiah, 135, 141 f., 148, 150, 186, 189, 194, 268, 282, 284 f.
and Deuteronomy. *See* Deuteronomy.

Idolatry, 8 f., 41, 125, 203.
Immanuel, 162 ff., 182, 276 ff., 282.
Individual piety, 24 f., 134, 162 f.
Intercourse with heathen, 115 f., 153 f., 205 ff.
Intermarriage, 207.
Intervention of Jahveh, in all prophets, 195, 234 f., 284.
in Elijah, 57, 260.
in JE, 11 f.
in Amos, 63, 73, 80 ff., 259.
in Hosea, 105, 133, 136, 139, 141.
in Isaiah, 144 ff., 151, 159, 162 f., 170, 186, 187, 284.
in Jeremiah, 239.
Isaac, 20, 247.
Isaiah, general, 32, 37, 52.
call, 144 ff. ; holiness, 145, 147.
redemption, 147 f., 157 f.
early message, 150 ff.
prophet of hope, 154 ff.
and Ahaz, 158 ff., 168 f., 179 f., 189 f.
sign, 161 f., 276.
Immanuel. *See* Immanuel.
Assyria in. *See* Assyria.
no politician, 171, 174, 179, 190.
quietist, 190.
true patriot, 187.
faith. *See* Faith.
remnant, 79, 135, 152, 170, 276.
kingdom of Israel, 180, 189.
Kingdom of God, 183 ff.
Messiah, 163, 180.
Golden Age, 185.
cult, 147, 180, 194.
universal religion, 189, 234.
and Amos. *See* under Amos.
and Deuteronomy. *See* under Deuteronomy.
and Hosea. *See* under Hosea.
Ishbaal, 50.
Ishmael, 25.

Jacob, 9, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, 245, 248, 267.
Jahveh, in proper names, 3, 55, 255.
the only God, 8 f., 39, 41, 56, 67 f., 71, 82, 92, 105, 133, 144 ff., 211, 235.

Jahveh, not *numen loci*, 9 ff., 244.
relation to nature, 11, 37, 69, 93; and cosmos, 69 ff., 105 f., 141 ff., 151 ff., 184 ff., 234 f., 244, 259 f., 275.
revealing Himself through man, 14 f., 40, 93 f., 134 f., 146, 149.
relation to Israel, 16, 38, 57 f., 82 f., 93 f., 108 ff., 112, 132, 145 f., 170 f., 201 f., 216 ff.
as Will, 23, 27, 38, 72, 83, 146, 164 f., 219 ff.
ethical nature, 23 ff., 53 ff., 65, 73 f., 77, 85, 91 ff., 95 f., 120 f., 124, 133 f., 146, 164, 185, 219 f., 227 f.
Holy One of Israel, 145.
of Hosts, 275.
free personality, 10 f., 19, 37 f., 76, 82, 131, 149, 165, 259 f.
JE stories, origin and sources, 4 f.
editors, 5 ff., 29 ff., 195, 243.
monotheism, 8, 23.
the sanctuaries in, 9 f., 12 ff.
Jahveh's nature and power in, 10 ff., 14.
religious emblems, 15.
sacrifice in, 16 ff., 20 f., 246.
claim allegiance to Jahveh, 18, 22 f.
ethics in, 23 f.
confidence in Jahveh, 23, 27, 246.
connected with sanctuaries, 32.
and early prophecy, 32, 54.
relation to Canaanites, 248.
and Amos. *See* under Amos.
and Hosea. *See* under Hosea.
Jehu, 45, 55, 255, 256.
house of, 62, 100, 104, 119.
Jeremiah, 1, 32, 48, 135, 232, 239 ff., 247, 292.
Jericho, 31.
Jeroboam I., 13, 49, 61, 194, 253.
Jeroboam II., 4, 59, 64, 75, 93, 104, 257.
Jeru'el, 247.
Jezebel, 54, 56, 255.
Jezreel, 265.
Joab, 254.
Jonathan, 270.
Joram, 55.
Joseph, 9, 17, 24, 26, 38.
Joseph-story, 7, 17, 26, 27, 244, 245, 248.
Josiah, 208, 223.

King, 2, 3, 36, 48, 53 ff., 58, 132 f., 137, 181, 183, 198, 220.
Kingdom of Israel, 2 f., 36, 47 ff., 57 f., 60 f., 104 f., 117 ff., 135, 165 f., 179 f., 251, 254 f.
Kingdom of God, 58, 179, 181, 184, 190, 284.
Kir, 77, 82, 94, 258.
Koran, 291.

Law of Jahveh, 14, 30 f., 85, 91, 114, 120 ff., 124, 196 ff., 243, 267 f., 270.
Levi, 27.
Levite, 30, 194.
Lot, 27.
Lot, the sacred, 31, 42 f.

Mahanaim, 12, 50.
Maher-shalal-hash-baz, 166, 167.
Mamre, 12.
Manasseh, 247.
Mazzeba, 14, 15, 16, 18, 204, 245.
Medians, 75.
Menahem, 75.
Messianic King, 135, 180 ff., 241, 278, 282, 283.
Micah, in Judges, 29 f., 288.
prophet, 157, 194, 284.
Micaiah ben Imlah, 46, 49, 55.
Mishpat, 91, 120, 269.
Mizpah, 98, 118, 122, 266.
Moab, 64, 65, 67, 76, 95, 261, 263.
Μοναρχία, 39, 41.
Monotheism, 8 f., 39, 41, 56, 67 f., 71, 82, 92, 105, 133, 144 ff., 211, 235, 290.
Morality. *See* Ethics.
Moriah, 247.
Moses, 27, 30, 245, 249, 250, 256, 260, 277.

Nabhi, 35, 249.
Naboth, 54, 254.
Napoleon, 287.
Nathan, 37, 46, 53.
Nations, 9, 16, 24, 26, 50 f., 64 f., 82, 85, 92, 94, 106 ff., 110 f., 142, 153 f., 171 ff., 182 f., 198, 203 f., 205 ff., 220, 273, 282.
Nature, phenomena in JE, 11 f.
in early prophecy, 37 ff., 260.
in Amos, 67, 93.
in Hosea, 141 f.
in Isaiah, 184 f., 284.
Necromancy, 40 ff., 204, 251.
New moon, 32, 86, 263.
Nicene Creed, 215.
Nineveh, 75, 77, 261, 281, 282. *See* also Assyria.
Noah, 16, 246, 260.

Omri, house of, 49, 255, 266.

Passover, 208, 236.
Paul, St., 39.
Pekah, 167.
Pelethites, 52.
Penuel, 12.
Pharisaism, 111, 233.
Pharisees, 128.
Philistines, 2, 44, 50, 52, 64, 65, 76, 82, 83, 94, 110, 174, 175, 252, 282.
Phœnicia, 117, 273. *See* also Tyre
Phylacteries, 204.
Pilgrimage, 22, 249.
Prediction of future, 36 f., 276.
Priesthood in early Israel, 29.
  its judicial functions, 30 f., 120, 269.
  connected with prophets, 31 f., 193.
  in Hosea, 120 ff., 132.
  in Deuteronomy, 198, 212 f.
Priestly Code, 213, 226, 237, 260, 284, 291.
Prophecy, voice of Jahvism, 33.
  its origin, 34 ; name, 35.
  as prediction, 36 f.
  declaring Jahveh's will, 39 f.
  and necromancy, 40.
  and sacred lot, 42.
  and ark, 43.
  medium of revelation, 42, 251.
  ecstasy, etc., 45 ff.
  supports, 48, and judges kingdom, 50 ff.
  has its own motives, 54.
Prophets, their function, 62.
  allied with priests, 31, 193.
  false, 45.
  no politicians, 75, 95, 106, 171.
  in view of Amos, 83, 93.
  conservatives, 228, 253 ff., 264.
  and the cult, 194 f.
  in Northern kingdom, 254.
Propitiation, 18, 19, 22, 246.
Providence, Divine, 17.
Pul, 75, 167, 266, 282.

Qahal, 204, 286.

Rabbah, 67, 70.
Rachel, 207.
Ramah, 31.
Rechabites, 55, 231, 250, 292.
Redemption, 147 ff.
Religion, national. *See* under Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Deuteronomy.
Remnant. *See* under Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah.
Resurrection, 283.
Rezin, 167.
Ro'eh, 36, 43, 250, 252.

Sabbath, 32, 86, 196, 226, 263, 291.
Sacrifice, in JE, 10, 16.
  in early Israel, 19, 29, 33, 214.
  Noah's, 246.
  child, 20, 246 f.
  in Amos, 87 ff.
  in Hosea, 125 ff., 132.
  in Deuteronomy, 198, 208 f., 214, 225, 236.
  in P.C., 212, 236.
Samaria, 13, 59, 66, 104, 126, 151, 153, 159, 160, 169, 172, 173, 257, 275.
Samson, 250.
Samuel, 31, 36, 38, 42, 44, 250, 253.
Sanctuary, in early Israel, 30, 208 ff., 249.
  centralisation, 211, 288, 289.
  effect, 212 f., 225.
  songs, 267, 271.
Sargon, 175, 281.
Saul, 3, 19, 29, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 44, 60, 118, 250, 253.
Scythians, 76, 261.
Seer. See *Ro'eh*.
Sennacherib, 156, 177, 178, 222, 287.
Shalmanasar, 75, 282.
Shear-jashub, 154, 167.
Shechem, 13, 98, 122, 131.
Shiloh, 12, 30, 31, 252.
Shunammite, the, 32.
Sichem, 247.
Sign, 161, 162, 277.
Siloah, 166, 279.
Simeon, 27.
Sin, 81, 84, 91, 107, 113 ff., 132 f., 195.
Sin-offering, 270.
Sinai, 10, 244 f., 277.
Sodom and Gomorrah, 24, 38.
Solomon, 13, 29, 49, 60.
Spirit of God, 2, 183, 250.
Syria and Syrians, 77, 82, 84, 94, 155, 258. *See* also Damascus.
Syro-Ephraimitic league, 153, 166, 168, 266, 273, 276.

Taanach, 13.
Tabor, 98, 122.
Tatian, 39, 251.
Tᵉhom, 67, 69, 70.
Tekoa, 247, 256 f.

Teman, 67.
Teraphim, 207, 248.
Theocracy, 118.
Theophany, in JE, 11.
in Elijah, 57, 255, 260.
in Amos, 69, 73 f., 260.
in Isaiah, 144, 153.
Tiglat Pileser. *See* Pul.
Tithes, 88, 226, 236, 245.
Tobit, 251.
Torah. *See* Law of Jahveh.
Trance, 34, 45.
Tribal organisation, 51 f., 60.
customs, 228, 253 f., 286, 288.
morals, 26, 51, 253.
worship, 208 ff., 249, 288.
Tsdhaqah, 91, 264.
Tyre, 55, 64, 257. *See* also Phœnicia.

Urartu, 75.
Uriah, 52, 254.
Urim and Thummim. *See* Lot, sacred.
Usury, 229, 291 f.
Utopia, 142, 184.
Uzziah, 144.

Van, Lake, 75.
Voltaire, 284.

War, laws of, 220, 236, 290 f.
Will. *See* under Jahveh.
Witchcraft. *See* Necromancy.

Zacchæus, 129.
Zadok, 194.
Zechariah, King, 104.
Zechariah, prophet, 265.
Zephaniah, 65, 76, 95, 105, 261, 282.
Zion, 69, 146, 170, 172, 173, 174, 234, 257.

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED
Edinburgh

A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith in Christendom and Beyond. By W. A. Curtis, B.D., D.Litt.(Edin.), Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Aberdeen. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

This book provides for the first time a Descriptive History in one volume of the Doctrinal Standards of the Religious World. Its twenty-five chapters contain, *inter alia*, the full Texts of the Ancient Creeds in the various stages of their evolution, careful analyses with extensive extracts of the principal Modern Confessions (including those of the Salvation Army, Christian Science, and Mormonism, and other recent organisations), and a discussion of the Practical and Ethical Problems connected with the Creeds.

The Religion of the Ancient Celts. By Canon MacCulloch, D.D., Author of several works on Folk-lore and Religion. Demy 8vo, 10s. net.

It covers the whole field of Celtic religion, and it is based on a fresh study of the sources, including folk-survivals and scattered notices in ecclesiastical documents, and its chapters include The Celtic People—The Gods of Gaul and the Celts—The Irish Mythological Cycle—The Gods of the Brythons—The Cúchulainn Cycle—The Fionn Cycle—Gods and Men—Cult of the Dead—Primitive Nature Worship—River and Well Worship—Tree and Plant Worship—Animal Worship—Sacrifice—Tabu—Festivals—The Druids—Magic—Rebirth and Transmigration—Elysium.

The Christian Doctrine of Man. By Professor H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., Leeds. Just Published. 6s. net.

'This work is one of the finest contributions which has been made for long to Biblical and philosophical theology, and will ensure an eager welcome to anything else from the same pen.'—Prof. James Denney, D.D.

The Ideal of Jesus. By Professor W. N. Clarke, Author of 'An Outline of Christian Theology.' Post 8vo, 5s. net.

Contents:—The Picture of the High Aim—The Kingdom—Righteousness—The Twofold Law of Love—The Filial Life—Deliverance from Evil—Liberty—Human Value—Justice—Wealth—Christianity—The Church—Society.

The Historical Narrative of the Old Testament. By the Rev. J. E. M'Fadyen, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature, and Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow. Price 6d. net.

Life's Christ Places. By Rev. Joseph Agnew, Dunbar. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

Every place visited by Christ during His life on earth may be associated with an experience which has its counterpart in the life of a Christian, and in this volume the author presents them in connected correlation.

The Philocalia of Origen. A Selection of Choice Passages from his Works by St. Gregory and St. Basil of Cæsarea. Translated into English from the Text of Dr. Robinson by the Rev. George Lewis, M.A.(Oxon. and London). Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

This 'admirable selection of passages,' to use Bishop Westcott's words, forms an excellent introduction to the study of Origen, and is almost indispensable to the student of Holy Scripture. 'Much of Origen's best thought,' says Dr. Robinson, 'is here presented to us, arranged under various important heads; and we are guided to the appreciation of his theological standpoint by two of the strongest intellects of the century after his own' (SS. Gregory and Basil).

Christ's Message of the Kingdom. A Course of Daily Study for Private Students and for Bible Circles. By A. G. HOGG, M.A., Professor of Mental and Moral Science in the Madras Christian College. Crown 8vo, in paper covers, 1s. 6d. net; in cloth, 2s. net.

'We have no fear of contradiction or complaint, as we call it the most valuable book of the season.'—*Expository Times.*

Visions and Revelations. Discourses on the Apocalypse. By the Rev. JOHN T. DEAN, M.A., Coldingham. Post 8vo, 5s. net.

"To many thoughtful readers this volume will break the seal of the Book of Revelation, and make its rich resources of teaching and comfort available for ordinary life."
London Quarterly Review.

Greece and Babylon: A Comparative Religious Enquiry. By L. R. FARNELL, M.A., D.Litt.(Oxford). Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Presents in outline the religions of the Mesopotamian Valley, of the leading Anatolian peoples, and of the Minoan-Mycenæan and Hellenic Societies, partly for the sake of the direct interest attaching to such a comparison, partly also with a view to testing the question of the religious influence of Babylonia upon the prehistoric Greece of the second millennium B.C. The enquiry includes a discussion of the morphology of these religions, of their salient rites, cults, cult-ideas, theology, and religious psychology, also their respective relations to social institutions and morality, and, finally, their eschatological ideas.

Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular. Containing Grammar, Text, and Glossary. By Professor ALBERT THUMB, Strassburg University. Translated from the Second Improved and Enlarged Edition by S. ANGUS, M.A., Ph.D. [*In the Press.*

Those who would appreciate Greek must know it in its long uninterrupted career from ancient Greek, through Hellenistic Greek, and finally in the modern *vernacular*. This form of language spoken by the common people is the real descendant of the ancient Greek, and reflects the chequered history of the Greek people. Prof. Thumb's grammar aims at being very practical, its double purpose being to serve—(1) as a guide to philologists who desire to take account of the latest development of the Greek language, and (2) as a Handbook for beginners, as proved by its division into Grammar, Texts, and Glossary. Prof. Thumb's name is a guarantee of accuracy and scholarship.

The Great Texts of the Bible. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, D.D

First Four-Volume Set (already published)—

1. ISAIAH.
2. ST. MARK.
3. GENESIS to NUMBERS.
4. ACTS, ROMANS i. to viii.

Second Four-Volume Set—

1. DEUTERONOMY to ESTHER.
2. ROMANS (Completion).
3. ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.
4. FIRST CORINTHIANS.

If the Four Volumes published in Spring and Autumn each year are ordered in advance, *before* 13*th December*, they will be supplied at the subscription price of 24s. net; otherwise, the published price of each Volume is 10s.

What is meant by 'THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE BIBLE'?

1. The best Texts have been chosen out of each book of the Bible.
2. Each Text opens with an Introduction, showing the circumstances of its utterance and its context.
3. Next, the chief topic is stated or suggested, and this is followed by the most natural and fruitful divisions.
4. Then comes a full exposition of the contents of the Text, expressed in good modern English, with a clear arrangement, and pointedly illustrated throughout.
5. An occasional suggestion for the practical use of the Text is given at the end.

A full Prospectus of 'The Great Texts of the Bible' free on application.

A GREAT ENCYCLOPÆDIA.

VOLUMES ONE, TWO, THREE AND FOUR — NOW READY
VOLUME FIVE — IN THE PRESS

ENCYCLOPÆDIA
OF
RELIGION AND ETHICS

EDITED BY

DR. JAMES HASTINGS.

THE purpose of this Encyclopædia is to give a complete account of Religion and Ethics so far as they are known. It will contain articles on every separate religious belief and practice, and on every ethical or philosophical idea and custom. Persons and places that have contributed to the History of religion and morals will also be described.

The Encyclopædia will cover a distinct department of knowledge. It is the department which has always exercised the greatest influence over men's lives, and its interest at least, if not its influence, is probably greater at the present time than ever. Within the scope of 'Religion and Ethics' come all the questions that are most keenly debated in PSYCHOLOGY and in SOCIALISM, while the title will be used to embrace the whole of THEOLOGY and PHILOSOPHY. Ethics and Morality will be handled as thoroughly as religion.

It is estimated that the work will be completed in Ten Volumes of about 900 pages each, size 11½ by 9.

PRICE—

In Cloth Binding . . 28s. net per volume.
In Half-Morocco . . 34s. net per volume.

OR, EACH VOLUME MAY BE HAD IN 12 MONTHLY PARTS, PRICE 2s. 6d. NET PER PART.

The full Prospectus may be had from any bookseller, or from the Publishers, on request.

'The general result of our examination enables us to say that the editor has risen to the height of his great undertaking. The work deserves the fullest and best encouragement which the world of readers and investigators can give it.'—*Athenæum.*

'A very warm tribute is due to the eminent publishers, Messrs. T. & T. Clark. They have done their part to admiration. No handier or more handsome encyclopædia exists. It is well printed, well bound, and very light in the hand. Those who know the immense risk and pains involved in a work of this kind will know how to estimate the services of Messrs. Clark in what is, we think, the boldest and most enterprising venture in religious literature which has ever been undertaken in this country. We wish them all the success they deserve, and that success should be very great. The services of Dr. Hastings and his loyal colleague Dr. Selbie demand an acknowledgment not less ample. . . . The scope of this encyclopædia is immense, and as for the quality of the articles, the list of the contributors proves that it is in general very high.

'It will be one of the most reassuring and encouraging signs of the times if this great and magnificent enterprise receives adequate encouragement and recognition.'—*British Weekly.*

'No library could be better provided with what men have said and thought through the ages on Religion and Ethics and all they imply than by this one library in itself. . . . Some of the articles themselves summarise a whole literature.'—*Public Opinion.*

SOMETHING ENTIRELY NEW. **NEVER ATTEMPTED BEFORE.**

'A triumphant and unqualified success. Indispensable to ministers and Bible students.'—Sir W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, LL.D.

NOW COMPLETE IN TWO VOLUMES

A DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS.

Edited by J. HASTINGS, D.D.

Price per Vol., in cloth binding, 21s. net; in half-morocco, gilt top, 26s. net.

The purpose of this Dictionary is to give an account of everything that relates to CHRIST—His Person, Life, Work, and Teaching.

The articles are not entirely limited to the Bible, but gather together whatever touches Christ in all the history and experience of the Church.

'The present volume worthily completes a unique work. The articles are rich in instruction and helpfulness to preachers and teachers. Even those who have the "Bible Dictionary" proper will not find this one superfluous, and to those who do not need the larger one, the present one will prove an excellent substitute.'—*London Quarterly Review.*

'The preacher's purpose is better served than it has ever been before.'—*Times.*

'A scholarly production, edited with admirable skill.'—*Christian World.*

'Valuable for all scholars and students, it should prove invaluable for the preacher.'—*Methodist Times.*

'No more useful present could be made to a young clergyman than a copy of this admirable work. The articles are by competent and scholarly writers, and are full of information and suggestiveness.'—*Guardian.*

'Invaluable to preachers and teachers, and ought to be in constant use.'—*Churchman.*

A full Prospectus, with specimen pages, may be had from any bookseller, or free from the Publishers on application.

The Earliest Life of Christ. Being the Diatessaron of Tatian. By the Rev. J. HAMLYN HILL, D.D. A Popular Edition, with Introduction. Demy 8vo, 3s. net.

Dr. Hamlyn Hill's larger Edition, containing the valuable Appendices, has been out of print for some time. It is hoped that the low price at which this edition is now issued will enable many to place in their libraries a copy of one of the most interesting of early Christian writings.

The New Testament of Higher Buddhism, containing 'The Awakening of Faith' (The Faith of the New Buddhism), 'The Essence of the Lotus Scripture.' Translated, with Introductions and Notes, by the Rev. TIMOTHY RICHARD, D.D., Litt.D., China. Post 8vo, 6s. net.

This book contains translations of two of the most important classics of the Mahayana School, with very full Introductions and Notes by Dr. Timothy Richard, whose name is known to every one who is acquainted with the East.

These two remarkable books have been the staple religious food of countless millions, and contain many doctrines wonderfully similar to those of the Christian Faith.

The International Theological Library.

EDITED BY

Principal S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D., and Professor C. A. BRIGGS, D.D.

'A valuable and much-needed addition to the theological literature of the English-speaking nations.'—*Academy.*

Eighteen Volumes are now ready, in Post 8vo, viz.:—

An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. By Professor S. R. Driver, D.D., Oxford. Eighth Edition, thoroughly revised. Price 12s.

The *Guardian* says: 'By far the best account of the great critical problems connected with the Old Testament that has yet been written. . . . It is a perfect marvel of compression and lucidity combined.'

Christian Ethics. By Newman Smyth, D.D. Third Edition. Price 10s. 6d.

The *Bookman* says: 'It is the work of a wise well-informed, independent, and thoroughly competent writer. It is sure to become *the* text-book in Christian Ethics.'

Apologetics; or, Christianity Defensively Stated. By the late Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D., Glasgow. Third Edition. Price 10s. 6d.

The *Expository Times* says: 'The force and the freshness of all the writings that Dr. Bruce has hitherto published have doubtless led many to look forward with eager hope to this work; and there need not be any fear of disappointment.'

History of Christian Doctrine. By Professor G. P. Fisher, D.D., LL.D., Yale. Second Edition. Price 12s.

The *Critical Review* says: 'A clear, readable, well-proportioned, and, regarding it as a whole, remarkably just and accurate account of what the course and development of doctrine throughout the ages, and in different countries, has been.'

A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. By Professor A. C. McGiffert, Ph.D., D.D., New York. Price 12s.

The *Literary World* says: 'A reverent and eminently candid treatment of the Apostolic Age in the light of research.'

Christian Institutions. By Professor A. V. G. Allen, D.D., Cambridge, U.S.A. Price 12s.

The *Christian World* says: 'Unquestionably Professor Allen's most solid performance; and that, in view of what he has already accomplished, is saying a great deal.'

Volumes now ready (continued)—

The Christian Pastor and the Working Church. By Washington Gladden, D.D., LL.D. Price 10s. 6d.

The *Baptist Magazine* says: 'There is scarcely a phase of pastoral duty which is not touched upon luminously and to good purpose.'

Canon and Text of the New Testament. By Professor Caspar René Gregory, D.D., LL.D., Leipzig. Price 12s.

The *Scotsman* says: 'A brilliant contribution to New Testament scholarship.'

The Theology of the New Testament. By Professor G. B. Stevens, D.D., Yale. Price 12s.

The Ancient Catholic Church. From the Accession of Trajan to the Fourth General Council [A.D. 98–451]. By the late Principal Rainy, D.D., Edinburgh. Price 12s.

The Greek and Eastern Churches. By Principal W. F. Adeney, D.D., Manchester. Price 12s.

Old Testament History. By Professor Henry P. Smith, D.D., Amherst. Price 12s.

The *Academy* says: 'The history of the little nation out of which was to arise the Sun of Righteousness, is clothed with an added charm of actuality, as it is presented in these sane and balanced pages.'

The Theology of the Old Testament. By the late Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Edinburgh. Second Edition. Price 12s.

The *Bookman* says: 'Contains the essence and strength of the whole work of one whom the best judges have pronounced to be a leader in Old Testament learning.'

The Christian Doctrine of Salvation. By Professor G. B. Stevens, D.D., Yale. Price 12s.

The *Expository Times* says: 'It is a great book upon a great subject. If preachers want to fit themselves for a winter's work of strong, healthy, persuasive preaching, this book will fit them.'

The Christian Doctrine of God. By Professor W. N. Clarke, D.D., Author of 'An Outline of Christian Theology.' Price 10s. 6d.

The *Baptist Times* says: 'It is as masterly, as inspiring and helpful a treatise as can be found in the famous series to which it belongs.'

History of the Reformation. By Principal T. M. Lindsay, D.D., Glasgow. In Two Volumes.

Vol. I.—**The Reformation in Germany, from its beginning to the Religious Peace of Augsburg.** Second Edition. Price 10s. 6d.

Vol. II.—**The Reformation in Lands beyond Germany.** With Map. Price 10s. 6d.

The *Times* says: 'At last the English public possesses an adequate History of the Reformation.'

An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. By Prof. James Moffatt, B.D., D.D., Oxford. Second Edition. Price 12s.

*** *A Prospectus giving full details of the Series, with list of Contributors, post free on application.*